

GLOUCESTER AND ITS ABBEY.

By E. A. FREEMAN, D.C.L., LL.D.

THE lands watered by the Severn and its tributaries are among those parts of England which have ever been richest in great ecclesiastical foundations. The Fenland alone, on the other side of our island, can set itself up as a rival in the number and fame of its abbeys and other renowned churches. Yorkshire indeed is popularly looked on as the land of abbeys; but Yorkshire must, in the nature of things, contain more of anything than any other shire: and no one will deny that in the matter of ruined monastic churches, mainly of the Cistercian order, though swelled by the great Benedictine house of Saint Mary in the northern metropolis, Yorkshire has an allowance even beyond its size. But Yorkshire, the kingdom of Deira, must enter the lists, not with single shires, but with other kingdoms; and I think that the old kingdom of the Hwiccas, the lands of Gloucester and Worcester, may hold its own even against Deira. Of Evesham, Winchcombe, Cirencester, names, if less romantic, more historic, than those of Cistercian churches hidden in their dales, we have the memory abiding. But their very names, the British *combe*, the Roman *chester*, the English *ham*, tell us that Winchcombe, Cirencester Evesham, are places which have a deeper root in the history of our land than any spot to which a Romance-speaking founder gave a name of his own devising whose ending in *vaua* or *vallis* announced its foreign origin. And of the great churches that still abide, Gloucester, Worcester, Tewkesbury, Bristol, Malvern, a fragment of Pershore, a more precious fragment of Deerhurst, can stand up against York, Beverley, Ripon, Selby, fragments of half destroyed Malton and Bridlington, another more venerable fragment of unfinished Lasingham. The Fenland indeed has, in

Peterborough and Ely, two minsters of such surpassing majesty that they need hardly call in vanished Ramsey, mutilated Thorney, and shattered Crowland, as allies in the competition with either the northern or the western land. I speak at this moment of the architectural grandeur of the surviving churches; in historic importance this land of the Hwiccas surely equals, I will not venture to say that it surpasses, the land of Saint Æthelthryth and Saint Guthlac. And, if it would hardly be wise to set up Gloucester, Worcester, and Tewkesbury, in an artistic rivalry with Peterborough and Ely, it may be well to remember that the men of the Fenland, for whom nature had done so little, had a special need to call in the consolation of art. No heights of Cotteswold or Malvern, no Uleybury crowned with its primæval barrow and its primæval camp, no distant mountains fencing in the home of the still abiding Briton, look down on the land which beheld the last struggle of Hereward, as they look down on the land which beheld the march of Godwine and the last battle-field of Simon. Not small indeed are the memories which gather round this land of hills and valleys and fruitful meadows. And if I cannot say, as in some sort at Lincoln or Durham I might dare to say,

"Tot congesta manu prœruptis oppida saxis,"

I may at least say;

*"Adde tot egregias urbes, operumque laborem,
Fluminaque antiquos subterlabentia muros."*

Out of the many Avons of our island you have one to flow by the fields and the towers of Evesham and of Tewkesbury, and another to flow by the healing founts of Bath to form the great haven of Bristol. And the wide Severn itself flows by the city which was saved by the prayers of Wulfstan and by the city which was won for the Saxon by the arms of Ceawlin, and at whose Midwinter feast King Edward and King William so often wore their crown.

Now I would ask you to mark my geography. My immediate business lies with your city of Gloucester, and with its great church, the church first of abbots and then of bishops. But I can hardly speak of Gloucester city or shire, without looking somewhat wider, without thinking of the greater whole of which

Gloucester, city and shire, forms a part. We are now in the ancient land of the Hwiccas, part of the land which Ceawlin won from the Briton in 577, so much of that land as lies north of the southern of the two Hwiccian Avons. We are in the land which saw the fight of Deorham, the land through which the conquering Saxon went on, like the conquering Hebrew, carrying havoc and slaughter from city to city. As he did unto Aquæ Solis and her king, so did he unto Corinium and her king, so did he unto Glevum and her king. So far the land north of Avon has the same history as the Saxon land to the south of it. Both were added to the possessions of the English folk by the same conqueror in the same act of conquest. But events a little later brought about a wide difference in the history of the two. The land south of Avon remained under West-Saxon rule; the land north of Avon passed under at least the supremacy of the Mercian kings. The two lands thus fell under two different laws with regard to their civil and ecclesiastical divisions. It has been my fate to be called on to set forth in more shapes than one the distinction in origin between the West-Saxon and the Mercian shires, between immemorial *pagi-gaue*, formed during the very work of the conquest, bearing the name of a people rather than the name of a town, and shires mapped out with reference to local capitals from which their names are taken, I have pointed out that, while that mapping out was mainly done in the reign of Eadward the Elder, in this south-western corner of Mercia it was possibly the work of Ælfred himself. From this difference immediately follows another difference which more directly concerns my subject. In Wessex the civil divisions are older than the ecclesiastical; in Mercia, setting aside modern changes, the ecclesiastical divisions are older than the civil. It is specially needful in this diocese and city to put modern changes out of one's thoughts; otherwise I may be asked, Is not the shire of Gloucester, dating perhaps from the days of Ælfred, certainly from those of his son, older than the diocese of Gloucester and Bristol, dating only from William the Fourth, or even than the separate diocese of Gloucester, dating only from Henry the Eighth? True; but the diocese of

Worcester, the bishopric of the Hwiccas, is older than the shires of Worcester and Gloucester. South of Avon on the other hand, the diocese of Wells, the bishopric of the Sumorsætan, is far younger than the land of the Sumorsætan; the older diocese of Winchester, the bishopric of the West-Saxons, is far younger than the West-Saxon kingdom. Now, if the bishopric of the Sumorsætan is younger than the land of Sumorsætan, so the bishopric of the Hwiccas is younger than the land of the Hwiccas. But then the land of the Sumorsætan still keeps its place, its name, and its boundaries on the modern map, while the land of the Hwiccas has passed away, cut up, perhaps a thousand years back, into the later shires which represent it. At the time of the changes under Henry the Eighth, the changes which made Gloucester an episcopal see, the Mercian dioceses, with the single exception of Ely, were all older than the shires; the West-Saxon shires were all older than the dioceses. The land of the Hwiccas was by that time forgotten; none but antiquaries were likely to know that the diocese of Worcester represented it. The land of the Sumorsætan needed not the diocese of Bath and Wells to represent it; it stood then, as it stands still, to speak for itself in its own name.

In speaking then of the city, the shire, the diocese, of Gloucester, I am speaking of something which has been cut off from a greater whole, that greater whole being the land and diocese of the Hwiccas. That land took in four of the still abiding cities of England, Worcester, Gloucester, Bristol, and Bath. Do not be surprised at my reckoning Bath among the cities of the Hwiccas. That city has, at least from the days of the Norman Conquest, undoubtedly formed part of the land of Somerset. But Bath stands north of Avon; in the days of Offa at all events, it formed part of the Mercian kingdom.¹ The boundaries of

¹I do not attach much value to the alleged charter of "Osricus rex" and the other notices of Bath which will be found in the *Monasticon*, ii. 263, 264. If genuine, they would make Bath a sister foundation with Gloucester; but at any rate they may be taken to shew that in the seventh and eighth centuries Bath was within the Mercian kingdom, and therefore was in the land of the Hwiccas. It doubtless formed part of the cession made at Cirencester.

kingdoms and shires often shifted, and at some time between Offa and William, Bath passed back again from Mercia to Wessex. But when Bath arose from its overthrow at the hands of Ceawlin, as Chester arose from its overthrow at the hands of Æthelfrith, it must have arisen, not as a West-Saxon, but as a Mercian town. The three *chesters* that Ceawlin overthrew in his first north-western inroad, Bathanceaster, Cirenceaster, Gleawanceaster, all lay north of Avon, all formed part of the land of the Hwiccas, no less than their northern fellow Wigraceaster. This last doubtless fell in his later and more northern raid, and rose again to become the ecclesiastical capital of the tribe that dwelled on the two Ayons.

Bath then, Bathchester, at some date that cannot be exactly fixed, passed away from the Hwiccas and from all Mercia to become one of the episcopal heads of the Sumorsætan. In so doing, it did but fall back on an older fellowship. First West-Saxon, it became Mercian, and then became West-Saxon again. The other *chesters* of the Hwiccian land, Worcester, Cirencester, Gloucester, first West-Saxon like Bath, when they had once become Mercian, remained Mercian. All of them became seats of great ecclesiastical foundations; two of them, at different ages, became the seats of bishoprics. And alongside of them another city which in the beginning was no city, no Roman *chester*, no capital, no bishopric, but a simple borough of English birth, grew up and outstripped them all. Worcester, Cirencester, Gloucester, are all ties which bind the England that now is to the Britain of Welsh and Roman times. Bristol stands apart, as wholly the creation of our own folk. Bristol too, called into being as a seat of commerce, put on an ecclesiastical life also. It became the seat of an abbey, and the abbey in after years grew into a bishopric. Winchcombe, Evesham, Tewkesbury, Pershore, Deerhurst, Malvern, all of them places of English birth, though British elements lurk in the names of more than one of them, became in one age or another, seats of famous monasteries. The land of the Hwiccas, as I have said, became a land specially rich in great churches and lordly prelates. And the monastic spots of the land naturally fell into several groups. In several of them the religious founda-

tion came first, the town grew up around it. Such was conspicuously the case at Evesham and at Malvern; so it was at Tewkesbury, Winchcombe, Pershore; all are abbey towns, Malvern more accurately a priory village. They are all creations of the English folk or rather of the English Church. Two of them grew to be parliamentary boroughs; Winchcombe gave its name to a shire which was merged in that of Gloucester. But none of them ever took a place among cities or towns of the first rank. Cirencester, in its modern aspect, may seem to belong to the same group. But its real history is wholly unlike theirs. Cirencester has a history which is in some sort at cross-purposes to the history of Bristol. Cirencester, a Roman city, sank to the level of Tewkesbury and Evesham. The seat, first of a college of secular priests, then of a mitred abbey, its historical importance was mainly ecclesiastical. Bristol on the other hand, the English merchant borough which shot ahead alike of Roman cities and of seats of ancient abbeys, has, from the twelfth century onward, stood high in ecclesiastical rank, but its ecclesiastical rank was something wholly secondary. Tewkesbury and Evesham owe whatever secular importance they have to their older ecclesiastical importance. They became boroughs because they were seats of monasteries. Bristol on the other hand owes its ecclesiastical importance to its older secular importance. It became the seat of priory, abbey, bishopric, and of the stateliest parish church in England, because it was already a great and flourishing borough. And if the ecclesiastical importance of comparatively modern Bristol was a consequence of its earlier secular importance, so was it in an earlier time with the immemorial cities of the Hwiccan land. Worcester became the seat of the ancient bishopric of the Hwiccan folk. Gloucester became the seat of a mighty abbey, to grow in after time into a second Hwiccan bishopric. Here and at Worcester the city is older than the monastery, while at Tewkesbury and Evesham the monastery is older than the borough. Settlers of various kind fixed themselves at Tewkesbury and Evesham because abbots had already settled there. But bishops and abbots came to Worcester and Gloucester because the immemorial Roman cities had already long been the chief dwelling-places of men in the land in which they stood.

Now my subject is Gloucester, not any other of the Hwiccian towns. But it is well to take in the special position of Gloucester among its neighbours, as a Roman city, which, because it had been a Roman city, became the seat of a great English abbey. In this history it is manifestly quite unlike the history of Bristol on one side or of Evesham on the other; but put only *bishopric* for *abbey*, or rather *bishop* for *abbot*, and the definition of Gloucester becomes equally the definition of Worcester. Worcester and Gloucester stand out before us as the two heads of the Hwiccian land; Worcester, the first in ecclesiastical rank, Gloucester, we may believe, the first in temporal importance. If Worcester was the seat of bishops, while Gloucester was the seat only of abbots, Gloucester become, in a way that Worcester never did, the seat of kings of the whole land. When the kingdom of the Hwiccas was divided into shires, each city became the head of a shire which bore its own name. The land thus divided for the purposes of the kingdom remained alike for the purposes of the Church. Gloucester, city and shire, remained part of the spiritual fold of the Bishop of Worcester. Ages after, the ecclesiastical arrangements conformed to the newer temporal arrangements, and Gloucester became the head of a separate diocese as well as of a separate shire. One fragment of the shire indeed, which had already won a separate civil being, won a separate ecclesiastical being too. Bristol, already a county, became also a diocese, or rather the head of a diocese whose body, by a strange piece of geography, lay far away in West-Saxon Dorset. A Bishop of Bristol whose flock dwelled away from his city on the shores of the English Channel might seem like a Mercian conqueror or colonizer in the West-Saxon land. Later arrangements indeed have brought Bristol back into the Hwiccian fold, giving back the *gá* of the Dorsætan to its elder shepherd at Salisbury. They have brought Bristol back, to make it the twin head, along with Gloucester, of a common ecclesiastical body.¹ But strange to say,

¹Since this was written, further changes again have been designed, which will make Bristol again a separate see with a somewhat anomalous diocese, but at any rate not so utterly cut off as when Bristol was the spiritual head of Wareham.

it has brought back with it new annexations from other ecclesiastical realms. That Bristol should enlarge itself ecclesiastically as well as civilly, that it should take in so much of itself as lies south of Avon, that it should even spread itself over its own suburbs, may be taken as retaliation for the West-Saxon annexation of Bath. It is stranger that Malmesbury and Cricklade should be torn away from the allegiance which they so long owe in succession to Winchester, to Ramsbury, to Salisbury old and new. This kind of mapping out of new boundaries confuses history and offends the geographical instinct. Divide a large shire or diocese into two; join two small ones into one; and geography does not complain of either process. But, whatever may be the practical gain for the present, the geographical instinct is offended when to the diocese formed by the division of the ancient diocese of the Hwiccas, scraps from other dioceses, from other ancient kingdoms, are added on.

Let us now look more specially to the history of Gloucester itself, and to other places only so far as they bear on the history of Gloucester. Yet we can hardly go through the older ecclesiastical history of Gloucester without some reference to the ancient mother church at Worcester; we can hardly go through its later ecclesiastical history without some reference to the modern fellow at Bristol. We can hardly discuss the architecture of the minster of Gloucester without some reference to the sister minster of Tewkesbury. Of Worcester and Gloucester indeed the history for a long time runs side by side. The two churches were founded almost at the same moment; the abbey of Gloucester was only a year or two younger than the bishopric of Worcester; and it is not easy to see why Gloucester rather than Worcester was not chosen as the seat of the bishopric. Or rather perhaps, according to English notions—English notions in this case being the same as British notions—it is easy to see. Britain, Celtic and Teutonic alike, never adopted the tradition of the mainland of Europe, which planted the bishopstool in the chief city of the diocese. One might almost risk the guess that Gloucester did not become the spiritual head of the Hwiccas because it was their temporal head. The

pre-eminent position of Gloucester somewhat later certainly makes makes us think that it became the temporal head of the district as soon as it came into being as an English town. But in the short interval of West-Saxon occupation, we have to ask the usual question whether the city existed or not. You may remark that I have more than once with some emphasis said the *city*. I am fully aware that Henry the Eighth, in founding the bishopric of Gloucester, conferred on the town of Gloucester the rank of a city.¹ The like grant has been made in our own time to Manchester, Saint Albans, Truro, Liverpool, and Newcastle-on-Tyne, and I believe that a little earlier Ripon took the rank of a city without any grant at all. The grant, and the assumption without a grant, alike go on the same principle, namely that the rank of a city—and, as far as I can see, it is simply a question of rank, and in no way a practical privilege—either belongs of necessity or ought of right to be granted to every town which is the seat of a bishop, and to none other. I know not the exact date or origin of this doctrine; it seems to have been fully established in the time of Henry the Eighth, it was certainly unknown in the time of Domesday; but I think I can see signs of it in the time of Richard the First.² In that great survey the name of *civitas* is given to Gloucester, Shrewsbury, Oxford, and other towns that were not bishops' sees, while it is not given to several towns that were. And the same language is commonly used in annals and documents of various kinds, the Gloucester chartulary for one. And certainly the right to the title of *civitas* would seem much more naturally to depend on the presence of a free municipal constitution, a rare thing is the time of Domesday, than on the presence of a bishop. I should therefore venture to follow the example of

¹*Monasticon* i., 553. "Quod tota villa nostra Gloucestriae ex nunc et deinceps in perpetuum sit civitas, ipsamque civitatem Gloucestriae vocari appellari et nominari volumus ac decernimus." A great deal follows about the county of the city and other matters.

²I infer this from the language of the Jew in Richard of the Devizes § 81; "Rovecestria et Cicestria viculi sunt, et cur civitates dici debeant praeter sedes flaminum nihil obtinent." Rochester appears in *Domesday* 76 as *civitas*, and Chichester in 23. The most unexpected use of the word is when Wareham appears as *civitas* in *Gesta Stephani*, p. 54. But Wareham, as its dykes show, has greatly shrunk up, like Rome, Autun, and Soest.

Domesday and the chartulary, and to speak of the city of Gloucester in days earlier than these when King Henry's charter professed to change the *villa* of Gloucester into a *civitas*.

In the last English city to which I was called on to make a discourse about itself, I had to tell its people that they had the privilege, if privilege it was, to be able to point to a single man, and that man a king and a king who bears the worst name among our kings, as their personal founder.¹ I had to tell the citizens of Carlisle that their city, in its present phase of its existence, was the erection of William Rufus. Now William Rufus has a good deal to do with the history of Gloucester; but I am not called on to insult the city by giving it so modern a founder. Gloucester had lived through a good many ages before either the second or the first William held his court here. Legend gives you a much earlier founder, and it may well be that the legend contains some kernel of truth. I certainly shall not take on myself to say that the name Gloucester means the city of Claudius; I will not say that Gloucester was a personal erection of the elder Emperor of that name during his very short stay in Britain. But the traditional connexion between Gloucester and Claudius does seem to have some ground to go upon. Glevum does seem, like Camulodunum, to have been an erection of the first stage, the Claudian stage, of Roman advance in Britain.² History may go thus far. Legend has added not a few details. A poet on the banks of Severn, Layamon himself, sang how "Claudius þe kæisere," whose name seem to alternate with that of Claudian the poet, received the submission of Arviragus and gave him to wife his daughter Genuis, an odd-sounding sister for Octavia and Britannicus. But Claudius himself gave them a younger brother of British stock, the Emperor's son by a British captive, who, in some undescribed kind of heathen baptism, received the name of Gloi. Now Arviragus and Genuis for their "mickle bliss" reared a borough on a very fair spot upon Severn, and for love of Claudius called it *Kair Olou*. But the

¹ See *English Towns and Districts*, p. 423.

² See Dr. Hübner's paper at the end of Mr. Bellows' *Glevum*, p. 7.

name stood not long, for, when Gloi was born and baptized, his father gave him the new borough, and changed its name to *Kair Gloi*. When he went back to Rome, taking with him Gloi's nameless mother, for other queen—Agrippina, Messallina, and their predecessors, having strangely vanished—he had none but Gloi, himself abode in *Caer Gloi* to be “deme and duc” there.¹ Let them take this eponymous hero that will. Of the two I would rather take Glovi the remote forefather of Vortigern, a forefather so remote that he has himself no recorded father, Claudian or otherwise, but who built a great city by the bank of the Severn, clearly in some very distant age.² Such founders as these you will perhaps hardly ask me to accept for you. Glovi, Glou, Glevum, Clevum, Glebon, are British and Roman names of the Roman *chester*, the real meaning of which I must ask some of our British friends to explain. But the belief in the Claudian origin of Gloucester took deep root. Not only has Geoffrey of Monmouth, and a poet who follows him into being a sounding gentile “Claudiocestrenis,” but the graver rubric of one of the Conqueror's laws describes it as enacted “in civitate Claudia.”³ In real history I can find no such stirring tale of the Roman life of Glevum as there is to tell of Eboracum, Verulamium, and Camalodunum, and of that Augusta whose imperial style soon

¹See Layamon I., 408. The passage begins :—

Muchel wes þa blisse :
 þe wes i þáue Bruttene.
 Mid þan kinge Aruirag.
 Aud þæn kæisere Claudius.
 þa wes þis folk swa bliðe
 Swa heo naere nauer aer on liue
 For þere muchele blisse.
 Heo aræden enne burge
 a enne swiðe feire stude
 uppe Sæuerne.

See also Mr. Earle, *Local Names in Gloucestershire*, *Archæological Journal*, xvii., 343.

²Nennius, C. 54. “Bonus, Paulus, Mauron, Guotolin, quatuor fratres fuerunt, filii Glovi qui ædificavit urbem magnam super ripam fluminis Sabrinæ, quæ vocatur Britannico sermone Cair-Glou, Saxonice autem Gloucestre.”

³See the Statute in Stubbs' *Select Charters*, 80.

yielded to its older name Londinium.¹ But I might have a stirring tale to tell if I could only believe the legend in which the sounding gentile name which I just quoted figures. It becomes the epithet of a duke, an early Duke of Gloucester, who, Briton as he is, has the presumption to kill Hengest, and that seemingly far away from Hengest's narrow range of action as we find it in the Chronicles. In Geoffrey of Monmouth this valiant personage bears the name of Eldol; in the poetic narrative he takes a shape which suggests more modern associations, and those of quite another kind. The slayer of the founder of England appears in sounding hexameters as

" Consul fortissimus Eldon
Claudiocestrensis."²

The valiant Eldon who slew Hengest of Kent may be left to the domain of fancy; we know at least the name and the fate of Coinmagil, one of the three kings who fell before the sword of Ceawlin on the field of Deorham.³ And as Coinmagil stands first on the list of three kings, while Gloucester stands first on list of the three *chesters*, we may infer that the seat of Coinmagil's kingdom was at Gloucester, a kingdom certainly of no great extent, as Cirencester and Bath had kings of their own. Kings at least they are in our own Chronicles; whether any of them could have been the style of *brenhin* in a chronicle of their own folk, I do not presume to guess. On that great day when Ceawlin slew three kings and marched forth to take three *chesters* the land that was to be the land of the Hwiccas was added to the possessions of the English folk. The day of Deorham was indeed one of the days which did most towards the Making of England. On that day the English folk for the first time hewed its way through that solid British mass which, a hundred and thirty years after the first landing at Ebbsfleet, still stretched unbroken from Clyde to the southern channel. And it was no slight pledge of the abiding nature of his conquest that the Teutonic

¹ Ammianus, xxvii., 8.

² *Gesta Regum Britannicæ*, edited by Francisque Michel, p. 84. The single combat of Eldon and "Engistus" follows at page 96.

³ See the *Chronicles*, 577.

conqueror held the city which formed the natural key of the lands which had yet to be won. The lowest point where sandy Severn could be bridled by a bridge became one of the strongholds of English power, the special seat of councils gathered to debate the means of holding the still unconquered Briton in check.

The conquerors of Gloucester were West-Saxon and heathen. At our next glimpse of the city a hundred and four years later, its rulers were Mercian and Christian. Or perhaps it might be true to say that the external overlord was Mercian, while the immediate prince and his people were still West-Saxon. The land of the Hwiccas is ruled by its own ealdorman or under-king, under the supremacy of the King of the Mercians. The Christian Osric is the man of the Christian Wulfhere, the son of the fierce heathen Penda. In the course of this century two great revolutions had taken place. The conqueror Penda had rent away the land north of the Avon from the grasp of the successors of Ceawlin. We may safely fix the date of this change to the year 628, the year of the fight waged by Penda against Cynegils and Cwichelm, and the treaty which followed the fight.¹ Wessex now begins to withdraw from northern conquest to find a field for her advance at the cost of the Britons of the West. The city of the treaty and the city of the Severn alike passed away to the master of Mid-England. But are we right in saying cities, or was it merely the sites of cities? That is to say, was Glevum, Cair Glovi, simply conquered, or was it destroyed, to lie waste for a season and to be called into being again at a later time? This last was the fate of Deva, Caerleon-on-Dee, Chester, City of the Legions, whose Roman walls stood empty without inhabitants for three hundred years till they received a new colony at the bidding of the Lady of the Mercians. The like was the fate of one of the cities which formed part of the same conquest as Glevum, of Aquæ Solis, Acemannesceaster, Bath. Bath, there can be little doubt, lay for a while desolate, to supply to an English poet a

¹ See the *Chronicles*, 628.

subject for musing on the vanity of human things.¹ It may then well be that Glevum perished in the like sort, that it lay desolate for a season, as Deva and Aquæ Solis lay for a season, as Calleva and Anderida lie desolate still. To this question general history can give no answer: I know not whether local research has lighted on any facts which may help to give an answer either way. But, whatever was the immediate fate of the Roman city, we know its position and its extent. The walls of Glevum do not abide like the walls of still peopled Camulodunum; like the walls of empty Calleva and Anderida. They have not even left such mighty and visible fragments as the walls of Lindum and Eboracum. But their circuit can be traced; the four arms of the Roman *chester* have left their abiding stamp on the streets of the modern city, and not a few pieces of the old rampart may be seen by those who are willing to search for them below the level of modern times.² And, in any case, if Gloucester ever stood empty, it could not have stood empty very long. It was again in being, again spoken of as a city, a hundred and four years after the conquest. It is then, in the year 681, that the ecclesiastical history of Gloucester begins.

According to the general rule which was followed throughout the conversion of England, the land of the Hwiccas, as forming a separate under-kingdom, was entitled to a bishop of its own. And, as the newly converted Mercian land was gradually brought under ecclesiastical rule, such a bishopric did not fail to appear. And, according to a rule only less general throughout Britain, both Celtic and Teutonic,³ the prelate of that bishopric did not

¹ The poem on ruins from the *Codex Ewoniensis* is printed by Grein, *Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Poesie*, p. 248. Only, when any Old-English writing is printed in Germany, one is driven wild by the absurd change of *w* into *v*. How do they expect us to call Beowulf or anybody else? Mr. Earle has ruled that the city spoken of is Bath.

² See *On the Ancient Wall of Gloucester, and some Roman Remains found in proximity to it, in 1873*. By John Bellows, Proceedings of the Cotteswold Field Club, vol. vi., pp. 154-187.

³ I have treated on this head in the note on "*Titles of Bishops and Bishoprics*." *Norman Conquest*, ii., 603.

bear as his title the name of any particular spot in his diocese, but the name of the land itself or rather of its folk. We do not as yet hear of a Bishop of Worcester, but of a Bishop of the Hwiccas.¹ But his bishopstool was at Worcester, which shows that, whatever may have been the fate of that *chester* when the land was won from the Briton by the West-Saxon and from the West-Saxon by the Mercian, Worcester, as well as Gloucester, was now a dwelling-place of the English folk, one of their chief dwelling-places in the Hwiccian land. The first bishop Bosel—his name sounds strange and I can give no further account of it—was much helped in his labours by the ubiquitous Wilfrith, ever ready to do or to suffer in any part of the world.² And fast on the foundation of the bishopric at Worcester, in the very next year, followed the first foundation of the abbey of Gloucester, the creation of the Hwiccian under-king Osric, with the assent of his temporal over-lord, King Æthelred and his spiritual pastor Bishop Bosel.³

Here then are the first great fruits of English Christianity in the Hwiccian under-kingdom. We must never forget what English conquest in the days of Ceawlin and Penda meant. It meant the uprooting of Christianity, the bringing in of heathendom, in a land which was already Christian. No feature of the conquest is more strongly insisted on than this in our own picture of English settlement from the vanquished side, in the Lamentation of Gildas. *Caer Glovi* was doubtless a Christian city; legend claims for it bishops and even archbishops, and gives us the names of some of them.⁴ All this rests on no evidence; still the legend is not actually impossible, like the legend which slays Hengest by the hands of Duke Eldon. If *Caer Glovi* never had bishops of its own, it certainly had Christian inhabitants, and Christian inhabitants imply at least

¹ See Bæda, iv., 23, v., 23.

² Bæda, iv., 23. So at least says the alleged charter of Æthelred, *Historia et Cartularium Monasterii, S. Petri, Gloucestricæ*, vol. i., lxxi, & p. 3.

³ Ibid, vol. i., p. 3.

⁴ See the *Chronicles*, 894.

presbyters. The short period of West-Saxon rule north of Avon was a purely heathen period; when Cwichelm gave up Gloucester and Cirencester to Penda, he was still the unregenerated pagan who two years before sent the murderer to slay Eadwine, not the hopeful convert who eight years later was christened and died at Dorchester on Thames. And what Cwichelm was Penda was, and something more. If the West-Saxon was *paganus*, the Mercian was *paganissimus*, not only a heathen, but himself an armed champion of heathendom. Under Ceawlin, under Cwichelm, under Penda, the altars of Christ throughout the Hwiccian land must have given way to the altars of Woden and Thunder. But on the question whether the city itself lay desolate for while hangs another question, were Woden and Thunder ever worshipped actually within its walls? Assuredly they never were worshipped within the walls of Caerleon-on-Dee, unless when the forsaken Roman rampart became for a moment a Danish fortress against Ælfred.¹ So here too it may well be that, when Penda had fallen before the arms of the Bretwalda of the North,² when the new faith spread over Mercia under Peada and Wulfhere, Christianity and human habitation found their way together within the forsaken walls of Glevum. It may be that, as Caer Glovi was a Christian city to its end, so Gleawceaster was a Christian city from its beginning. It may be that Bosel and Osric found no altars of Woden to overthrow, but that, like Augustine at Canterbury, they found hallowed sites and fallen temples of Christ which they could again turn back to their ancient use. All this is conjecture; it all may be so; it is not unlikely to be so, but that is all. Still our first glimpse of English Gloucester sets it before us a Christian city. The city or its site is shrouded in darkness for the whole century between the conquest by Ceawlin and the foundation of the first abbey by Osric.

And now one word more about the name of the city and of the shire to which, after the use of Mercia, it has given its name.

¹ See the *Chronicles*, 894.

² See the *Chronicles*, 365. And more fully, Bæda, 324.

We may cast "*Claudius p̄e keisere*" aside, and we need not trouble ourselves about any personal *Gloi* or *Glovi*. The Latin, the British, and the English names of the city, *Glevum*, *Caer Glovi*, and *Gleaweceaster*—in the various spellings of each—are simply the same name modified in each case according to the genius of the Latin, the British, and the English language. The first letter seem to have fluctuated a little between *c* and *g*, as seems implied in *Layamon's* strange story about the town being first called *Kair Clov* and then *Kair Glovi*. The course of change is simple; the name is of course British to start with; it takes a Latin form; the later Briton speaks of the place by its Latin name or his corruption of it with the prefix of his own tongue, *caer*; the Englishman speaks of it by its Latin name or his corruption of it, with the affix of his own tongue, *ceaster*. *Caer Glovi* and *Gleaweceaster* are simply the British and the English ways of saying "city of *Glevum*." From the West-Saxon conquest onward, *Gleaweceaster*, *Gloucester*, the name being made shorter to the ear than to the eye, has remained the English name of the city. And plain Englishmen, even in writing Latin, have been contented with such forms as *Gloucestria*. The rival form *Glaworna* seems more elegant, and to come more directly from the British forms. *Claudiocestra*, we may leave, it might be held, not to the Britons, who have the sense to say *Caer Lloyw*, but to those who retail British fables in Latin prose or verse.

Gloucester then makes its beginning in English history towards the end of the seventh century, as an English and Christian city, seemingly the temporal head of the *Hwiccas*, the seat of what was doubtless even then, according to the standard of the seventh century, a great religious foundation. That foundation began its career as a home of the devouter sex, at all events as a monastery under rules of the devouter sex. Three abbesses of princely rank reigned at Gloucester, *Cyneburh* the founder's sister, *Eadburh*, the widow of King *Wulfhere*, and one who bears the more puzzling names of *Eva* and *Gaffe*.¹ The

¹ She appears as *Eva* in the *Gloucester History*, *Hist. et Cart.*, vol. i., p. 7, and as *Gaffe* in page 4. Of the two names *Gaffe* sounds more English than *Eva*; but I do not see what name can be meant.

house received many gifts, among them the bodies of its founder and other illustrious persons. It flourished in this its first estate till the wars of the first part of the ninth century, the wars that gave Ecgberht of Wessex his place as the eighth Bretwalda. Then, from some cause or another, the succession of abbesses comes to an end; the nuns are said to have fled, and the house of Saint Peter of Gloucester becomes a home of secular priests. The credit of this second foundation is given to King Beornwulf of Mercia, and the date is somewhat strangely fixed to the years 823, a busy and a fatal year for Beornwulf, as it saw both his defeat by Ecgberht at Ellandún, and his death at the hands of the East-Angles.¹ In the course of the next century another ecclesiastical foundation arose at Gloucester distinct from the house of Osric, though in its near neighbourhood. Ealdorman Æthelred and his renowned wife the Lady of the Mercians founded the church of Saint Oswald at Gloucester, for secular priests as well as its neighbours. It stood outside the Roman wall; its safety was perhaps assured by a precious relic; for it boasted of holding the body of the martyred Northumbrian Bretwalda, translated thither from its first resting-place at Bardeney.² Of the church of Saint Oswald, better

¹ As Beornwulf counts for a local hero, I may recall the fragment of an ancient ballad about his death, which we have in three tongues. In the English version of Peter Langtoft we find it in English, though not contemporary English:

Under Elendoune þe bataile was smyten
Men syng in þat cwntry (fele zit it witen):
"Elendoune, Elendoune, þi lond is fulle rede
Of þe blode of Bernewolf, þer he toke his dede."

Henry of Huntington, iv., 29, gives an echo in his Latin prose: "Egbricht, xxiv. anno regni sui commisit prælium contra Beornwulf regem Merce apud Ellendune; unde dicitur: 'Ellendune rivus cruore rubuit, ruina restitit, fœtore tabuit.'" Lastly, we have Peter Langtoft's French version, I., 296:—

"Desuth Elendoune la guere fu finye
En proverbe auncyen sovent le ay oye,
Elendoune, Elendoune, ta terre est rubye
Du saunk le ray Bernulphe à sa cravauntye."

² See Bæda, iii., 11. See also Will. Malms, *Gest. Pont.*, iv., 155, and *Gesta Regum*, i., 49, "Ossa beatissimi Oswaldi cum ea loca infestarent barbari, Glocestram translata: locus iste, canonicos habens, non multo incolitur habitatore." This seems to refer to Saint Oswalds.

known as Saint Katharine's, a shattered ruin only is left, a choir, it would seem, which perished at the dissolution, a parish nave that survived till the civil wars. And in its shattered walls, among a crowd of fragments of many dates built up from many parts of the buildings, one stone still abides, a small baluster, or rather a respond in the shape of a baluster, which we can hardly doubt is a genuine relic of the work of the Lady. The great abbey itself has no such witness to show of the days when England was growing into oneness.

One might look on the translation of Northumbrian Oswald to Hwiccian soil as part of the spoils of victory borne off by Æthelflæd and her brother. We here find the beginning of that remarkable connexion between Gloucester and the Northern primatial see which sometimes looks rather like a Northumbrian invasion of southern lands. For many generations a close tie binds together Northern England and the diocese of Worcester, especially the churches of Gloucester. Sometimes, as in the case of Wulfstan, the Northumbrian archbishopric and the Mercian bishopric are held together. Sometimes the Northumbrian Primate tries to add to the scanty number of his suffragans by claiming the diocese of the Hwiccas as part of his province.¹ Sometimes he is charged with detaining lands belonging to Saint Peter of Gloucester. And at last, when all such claims are withdrawn, the patronage of Saint Oswald of Gloucester is given to the Archbishop of York as part of his compensation.² If the date given to the foundation of Beornwulf is the right one, the church of Gloucester remained in its second state under secular priests for 199 years. Then, in the year 1022, when Cnut was on the throne of England, and when the episcopal chair of Worcester, and, according to the tendency above mentioned, the throne of York also with it, was filled by the earlier Wulfstan, the renowned preacher of the memorable sermon to the English folk;³

¹ As Thomas of Bayeux, see *Norman Conquest*, iv., 355.

² As Ealdred, *Norman Conquest*, ii., 436, v., 760, and for the compromise, *William Rufus*, i., 447.

³ See *Norman Conquest*, i., 683.

the change which that age saw in so many other churches took place at Gloucester also. By the action of Archbishop Wulfstan, with the consent of King Cnut, the secular canons were removed from the church of Saint Peter; the monastic rule was brought in, and Eadric began the line of the abbots, in time to become the mitred abbots, of the great Benedictine house of Gloucester.¹

By this time Saint Peter had another ecclesiastical corporation by its side in the shape of Saint Oswald's. And this neighbourhood influenced the style of the elder house. In a document in the Gloucester Chartulary Eadric describes himself as Abbot of the Old Home—"Abbas in Ealdanhame"—and the deed is witnessed by the congregation of the old minster—"tota congregatio veteris monasterii."² At Gloucester, no less than at Winchester, the old minster had to be distinguished from the new.

Meanwhile the name of Gloucester city appears not a few times in the general history of England. It was emphatically a royal city. As the making of England went on, as the under-kingdom of the Hwiccas merged in the kingdom of the Mercians and the kingdom of the Mercians merged in the kingdom of the English, Gloucester became one of the chief places for gatherings for the whole kingdom. In the eleventh century, alike under Eadward and under William, it was established as one of the three places where the King yearly wore his crown, where, at the season of one of the great feasts of the Church, he appeared before the nation in the full pomp of kingship, and gathered around him his Witan and his whole folk, at once to see the greatness of their sovereign and to share his counsels for the government of his realm. When the land still knew no single capital, when different parts of the kingdom in turn beheld the meetings of the King and his people, the geographical position of Gloucester gave it every claim to be chosen as one of these great national centres. If the King wore his crown at Easter at

¹ *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 8.

² The document is in Mr. Hart's *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 8. It is fixed, if not to the year 1022, at any rate to the early days of Cnut, by the reference to the great Danegeld of 1018. See *Norman Conquest*, i., 418.

Winchester and at Pentecost at Westminster, the Midwinter feast and the assembly which attended it were, no less by established use, held at Gloucester. This practice suggests that Gloucester, no less than Winchester from of old, and Westminster at least from the days of the Confessor, was one of the chief dwelling-places of the kings. A royal house of the older pattern was the predecessor of the Norman castle which arose at the bidding of the Conqueror. In short, while we may suspect that Gloucester had been the capital of the kingdom of the Hwiccas, that it remained the capital of the Mercian lordship of Æthelred and Æthelflæd, it is certain that in the days of King Eadward and King William, it counted as one of the three capitals of the whole kingdom. Certain too it is that Gloucester was visited not a few times by kings and kingly persons, alive and dead, at other times than those prescribed for the holding of national assemblies. In 928 the Lady of the Mercians died at Tamworth, one of the fortresses which she had strengthened against the Dane; but her body was carried to Gloucester, seemingly as her capital, and was there laid, not in her own church of Saint Oswald, but in the east porch of the older minster of Saint Peter.¹ On the other hand in 940 Glorious Æthelstan died at Gloucester; but it is Malmesbury that claims to be the place of his burial. In the next century the Gemóts of Gloucester are endless, and some of them are among the most memorable in our history. And memorable events also happen at Gloucester which are not directly connected with the holding of the regular Gemóts. It was at least in the immediate neighbourhood of Gloucester that, towards the end of the year of the battles of Cnut and Eadmund, the year 1016, the two rivals met on Olney in the Severn, legend says for a fierce *holmgang*, history says for a peaceful conference, and there agreed on the treaty which for a moment divided England between them.² In the next generation we find Harthacnut holding his Midwinter

¹ This statement in all its local definiteness comes from the *Chronicles*, 918. "And hire lic lið binnan Gleawceastre on þam east portice Sce Petres ciricean."

² See *Norman Conquest*, i. 396, 705.

feast at Gloucester, and there selling the bishopric of Durham.¹ It is to be hoped that he held his banquettings in his own house and at his own cost. To have provided for the four daily meals of all Harthacnut's loaf-eaters would have been a heavy drain on the revenues of either abbot or earl.² Two years later we find Gloucester the scene of a remarkable assembly which, as it was held in November instead of at Christmas, must have been an assembly specially summoned. There the meek Confessor decreed the spoilation of all his mother's treasures, and sent the great Earls, Godwine, Leofric, and Siward, to ride with all speed to Winchester, and carry out the decree.³ And he was tarrying at Gloucester at a more memorable time. He was there in the autumn of 1051, when Eustace of Boulogne came to make his moan how Englishmen had refused to allow strangers to enter and occupy their homes at pleasure, and when Godwine refused, even at his prince's bidding, to carry fire and sword among the uncondemned and untried folk of his own earldom. I have striven elsewhere to tell the tale and to paint the picture, how the patriot host gathered at the bidding of their earls on the lofty ground of Beverstone, how they marched along the heights that overlook your fruitful valley and your broad river, to meet, but not in arms, the hosts of northern and central England gathered around their king in your own city.⁴ One leaps, as by instinct, from the eleventh century to the seventeenth. Then again we find Gloucester the centre of a patriotic struggle; only then the king is without the walls, and the defenders of English freedom are within them. A year later, Godwine has fallen and risen again; he has gone into banishment at the bidding of strangers, and has been welcomed

¹ *Ibid.* i. 527.

² See the curious passage in Henry of Huntingdon, vi. 201 where he complains of the few meals of the kings of his own time. "Tantæ namque largitatis fertur fuisse, ut prandia regalia quatuor in die vicibus omni curiæ suæ faceret apponi, malens a vocatis apposita fercula demitti, quam a non vocatis apponenda fercula reposci: cum nostri temporis consuetudo sit, causa vel avaritiæ, vel ut ipsi dicunt, fastidii, principes semel in die tantum suis escas antepondere."

³ See *Norman Conquest*, ii. 68.

⁴ *Ibid.* 141-147.

back to his country and to his earldom by the rejoicing voice of the English folk. The Midwinter feast of 1052 saw King Eadward again at Gloucester, not this time to seek the slaughter of English burghers or the banishment of English earls, but to order—by bill of attainder, it would seem—the beheading of a troublesome Welsh prince, and to have the head brought to him before the holy season was over.¹

During all the Welsh wars of this time, Gloucester, as one of the keys of England towards the Briton, naturally holds one of the foremost places. It is the meeting-place alike of councils and of armies, whenever anything was to be devised or done which bore upon the affairs of the Welsh border. Two years after the beheading of Rhys, when the foreign tactics of Ralph the Timid had brought defeat on the English arms, when Gruffydd and the rebel Ælfgar had laid waste Hereford, city and shire, King Eadward is again at Gloucester, and Gloucester is the trysting-place of the forces of Earl Harold in his first campaign against the Britons.² It was at Gloucester again, in the Midwinter Gemôt of 1062, that order was taken for Harold's great and final campaign in Wales. For that campaign itself Harold indeed set forth by sea for Bristol; but it was from Gloucester that he set out, and it was to Gloucester that he came back, in that rehearsal as it were of the great enterprise, when he burned King Gruffydd's house at Rhuddlan and the ships in the neighbouring haven.³ And in this respect the Norman Conquest made no change in the position of the city. We know not the exact date of the Conquest of Gloucestershire; but it can hardly have been till after the fall of Exeter in 1068. The city at once appears again as the place for the Midwinter assembly, when the king wore his *cynehelm*, and gathered around him archbishops and bishops, abbots and earls, and knights.⁴ It was at Gloucester, "in civitate Claudia," that the Conqueror put forth the law that Frenchmen who had

¹ *Norman Conquest*, 355.

² *Ibid.* 400.

³ *Ibid.* 475-477.

⁴ *Chronicles*, 1087. "On Eastron ne hine bæc on Winceastre, on Pentecosten on West mynstre, on Mide wintre on Gleaweceastre. And þænne wæron mid ealle þa rice men ofer eall Englalond arcebiscopas leodbiscopas and abbodas and eorlas þegnas and cnihtas."

settled in England in King Eadward's time should count as Englishmen—strange comment on the dreams of those who have pictured to themselves a wide and impassable gap between "Normans and Saxons."¹ And later in his reign, at the Midwinter of 1085, a far more memorable enactment was made in a Gemót of Gloucester. There the King held his court for five days; there, according to the innovation of the Conqueror's own reign, Archbishop Lanfranc held his separate synod for three days. And in this gathering it was that the King had that mickle thought and deep speech with his Witan, that mickle thought how his land was set and of what men, of which came the unique treasure of the eleventh century, the priceless record of Domesday.²

The importance of Gloucester, great under Eadward and under William the Great, was certainly in no way lessened under William the Red. I look through my own chronology of his reign, and I doubt whether the name of any other place appears so often as that of Gloucester, unless it be that of Le Mans. Gloucester and Le Mans certainly figure in those annals in different character. Le Mans is pre-eminently the city of warfare; Gloucester is still above all things the city of assemblies, the city where a good deal of fighting was decreed, but where no fighting actually took place. And yet, in the year of rebellion, when the Norman king was kept on his throne by the loyalty of the English people, a good deal of fighting went on at places at no great distance. The other cities the history of which is entwined with that of Gloucester figure in the tale, but not Gloucester itself. Bishop Geoffrey of Coutances turned Bristol into a den of robbers, and thence sent forth William of Eu to burn Bath and lay waste Berkeley.³ Before Worcester the Normans and the Britons were

¹ Stubbs, *Select Charters*, 80. *Norman Conquest*, iv. 620.

² *Chronicles*, 108, 5. "Da to þam mide wintre waes se cyng on Gleaweceastre mid his witan, and heold þær his hired v dagas, and siððan þe arceb' and gehadode men hæfden sinod þreo dagas * * * Æfter þisum hæfde se cyng mycel geþeabt and swiðe deope spæce wið his witan ymbe þys land hu hit wære gesett oððe mid hwilcon mannon."

³ See *William Rufus*, i. 37, et seqq. The words of the *Chronicle* 1088, are terse enough: "Gosfrið bisceop and Rodbeard a Mundbracg ferdon to Brigstowe and hergodon, and brohton to þam castele þa hergunge."

overthrown by the voice of English Wulfstan.¹ But of Gloucester itself we hear nothing during the rebellion against the second William any more than we do during the Conquest wrought by the first. I do indeed find a report that Duke Robert's party—we cannot call them his followers—burned church and city at Gloucester, not in the year 1088, in which they did burn a good many places, but in 1087, where there was no such party in being to burn anything. There are plenty of real burnings of Gloucester somewhat later; but for this in 1087 or 1088 the *Monasticon* gives no better reference than to a county history, and it is quite impossible to find a place for it in the recorded annals of the time.² There is perhaps really nothing very wonderful, if, when Bristol and Worcester were chief seats of warfare at the hands of two distinct sets of enemies, the ravages of one party failed to reach so far south, while the ravages of the other failed to recoil so far north. At any rate, if those who harried Berkeley had gone on to burn Gloucester, the contemporary chroniclers of their doings, above all he who wrote at Worcester, were not likely to leave out the greater exploits of the two. Anyhow, if we have nothing to say of Gloucester at this moment, the blank is filled up before long; a little later Gloucester seems to figure as the very centre of English history. In the memorable year which beheld the beginning of the primacy of Anselm, everything seems to gather round the city by the Severn-bridge. It was at the Midwinter assembly of 1092, therefore doubtless at Gloucester, that all hearts were stirred at the long vacancy of the archbishopric, and that the Witan petitioned the King to allow prayers to be put up in all churches for the turning of his own heart.³ It was to Gloucester that two months later the sick and repentant king was brought from Alvestone; it was there that the unwilling Anselm was named to the highest place in the English Church,

¹ See *William Rufus*, i., 47, and Note D, App. ii., 475.

² *Monasticon* i., 532. "In 1087, the new minster, as Alred's building was termed, was burnt with the greater part of the city by the adherents of Robert, Duke of Normandy." But no better reference is given than Rudder, *History of Gloucester*, p. 81.

³ See *William Rufus*, i., 388.

that the staff was thrust by main force between his clenched fingers, that by main force he was imprisoned in an episcopal chair, that he spake his parable against his own nomination, the parable of warning against yoking together an old feeble sheep and an untamed wild bull.¹ In the same city, in the same memorable Lent, came the ambassadors of Malcolm of Scotland, to be received with courtesy and treated with reason, by the repentant king still on his sick bed. Again a few months later, at Gloucester, the King of Scots comes in person, to be received with scorn by an overlord who was no longer either sick or repentant, and to go back to his own land to avenge his wrongs by that last invasion of Northern England which cost him his life at Alnwick.² A few months later again the Witan of England came together at Gloucester for the Midwinter feast of that year. Then came the bodes of Duke Robert of Normandy to challenge King William of England to arbitration or to war. Then war was decreed; then the great men of the land were called to contribute to its cost; then Anselm won the Red King's disfavour by refusing to grind his already suffering tenants to satisfy the sovereign's greed of money.³

The series of assemblies at Gloucester was for several years interrupted by the Red King's absence in Normandy at the tide of Christmas. But his last Midwinter feast was kept in its regular place, though we have no record of its acts. And it was from Gloucester, not indeed from the royal castle, not from the hall, if hall they had, of the citizens, but from the pulpit of the newly hallowed minster of Saint Peter that the voice of warning came to the Red King on the day before his death.⁴ Our glance at Gloucester in its national aspect, as one of the established meeting places of the Great Council of the nation, has carried us far in advance of the local history of city and abbey. We must go back nearly eighty years to take up the tale of the church of Saint Peter from the time of its submission to Benedictine rule.

¹ See the wonderful description in Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, 16-18. See *William Rufus*, i., 401-402.

² *Ibid.*, ii., 9, 10, 16.

³ *Ibid.* i., 435, 438.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ii., 317.

We saw Abbot Eadric installed in the days of Cnut as the first chief of the house in its new character. He bears a bad report for wasting the goods of his church and alienating its land.¹ The close connexion between the abbey of Gloucester and the bishopric of Worcester, much closer certainly than is commonly to be found between abbey and bishopric, is shown by the nomination of his successor Wulfstan by bishop Ealdred.² Let no one confound this Wulfstan with the Archbishop of York and Bishop of Worcester who has now been dead more than thirty years, nor yet with the saint of the same name who was now prior of the church of Worcester, and was presently to become its bishop. But the Bishop of Worcester not only appoints the Abbot of Gloucester, he rebuilds the minster of Gloucester, and seemingly takes to himself some of the lands of the abbey of Gloucester by way of payment of his expenses.³ What the Bishop of Worcester took the Archbishop of York kept and handed on to his successor. English Ealdred made no restitution to English Wulfstan, but Norman Thomas did make restitution to Norman Serlo.⁴ This last prelate did not, like

¹ *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 8. "Multa bona dissipavit, quoniam tempore suo, in perpetuam exhaeredationem, vendita fuerunt maneria de Beggeworth, de Hatherleye."

² *Ibid.*, i., 9. "Aldredus, Wygorniensis episcopus, Wilstanum Wygornia monachum in abbatem Gloucestriae consecravit, anno Domini millesimo quinquagesimo octavo, et de licentia regis Edwardi Confessoris, ibidem constituit."

³ *Ibid.* "Ipse Alredus ecclesiam illam a fundamentis construxit de novo, et in honore principis Apostolorum Petri honorifice dedicavit, sed causa magis hospitii quam operis sui abstulit a communi, Leche, Odynton, Standische, cum Bertona, retinens in manu sua. Tandem in archiepiscopum ecclesiae Eboracensis consecratur, qui ipsa maneria ecclesiae Eboracensi appropriavit." For the main facts the local writer here follows Florence, 1058: "Aldredus Wigorniensis episcopus ecclesiam, quam in civitate Glaworna a fundamentis construxerat, in honorem principis Apostolorum Petri, honorifice dedicavit; et postea, regis licentia, Wlstanum Wigornensem monachum a se ordinatum, abbatem constituit ibidem."

⁴ The local history records this restitution with great glee. "Anno Domini millesimo nonagesimo quinto, dominica in ramis palmarum, venerabilis Eboracensis archiepiscopus Thomas reddidit Glovernensi ecclesiae villas Lech, Odyntunam, Standysesche, Bertonam semetipsum graviter inculpando, pectus tundendo, genu flectendo, quia injuste eas tamdiu tenuerat. Haec acta sunt in praesentia domini Serlonis abbatis in capitulo monachorum, multis praesentibus et gaudentibus."—*Hist. et Cart.*, i., 11.

some prelates of his nation, climb up into his English sheepfold in some irregular way. He succeeded, six years after King William came into England, to an abbey lawfully vacant by the death of Abbot Wulfstan on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem.¹ The motives of such a pilgrimage in the early years of Norman occupation are left unexplained. Did he go simply for his own soul's health, or because Ealdred had gone before him, or because he found Sheriff Urse of Abetot, who ruled over Gloucestershire as well as Worcestershire, too unpleasant a neighbour? In any case the act sounds like a forsaking of his immediate flock at a dangerous time. Anyhow he went; he died; and, according to the usual but not universal practice of the Conqueror's reign, a Norman took his place. Serlo, once a secular canon of Avranches, than a monk of Saint Michael-in-peril-of-the-sea, placed by the Conqueror in the abbatial stall of Saint Peter's, is found allying himself in a bond of spiritual brotherhood with his diocesan, the English Saint Wulfstan, and with several other abbots both of Norman and of English birth.² We cannot be certain whether Serlo did or did not understand the English of the document to which he set his seal; the document itself shows that the Norman abbot did not, according to the fanciful romance which has displaced the real history of these times, look on his English neighbours as Saxon swine. The praises of Serlo, as a model of all monastic perfection, are sung both in prose and verse. He was a wall of the Church, a sword of virtue, a trumpet of righteousness.

"Ecclesiæ murus cecidit, Serlone cadente,
Virtutis gladius, buccina justitiæ."³

¹ *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 9.

² This is that precious document which is printed by Mr. Hart in the Introduction to the third volume of the *Gloucester Chartulary*, p. xviii., on which I have enlarged, *Norman Conquest*, iv. 382. But I ever wonder more and more how any man could so confuse his Wulfstans as to see a document of the time of Cnut in an engagement entered into by perfectly well-known men who say "We willað urum woruld hlaforde Willelme cininge and Mahthilde bære hlæfdian holde beon for Gode and for worulde."

³ The epigram on Serlo by Godfrey, Prior of Winchester, is copied in the *Chartulary*. It is also quoted by William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum*, v., 441.

He found something at Gloucester to reform and to complete. Owing perhaps to the absence of Abbot Wulfstan, he found at Saint Peter's only two monks of full age and eight young novices. He seems to have filled up vacancies with his own countrymen, Peter the prior we may set down as certainly a stranger, and Odo the cellarer is more likely to have been a French Eudes than an English Odda.¹ He also found something to rebuild. And this brings us to another side of our story; with Ealdred we get our first definite portion of architectural works in Saint Peter's minster. With Serlo we get our first glimpses of Saint Peter's minster that still abides.

Now it is certain that there was a church of some kind, a predecessor, however humble, of the cathedral church that now is, at least from the days of Osric, during the time of the abbesses and of the secular canons. But more than this we cannot say, except that it contained an altar of Saint Petronilla.² The great church of Gloucester cannot, like Bradford and Jarrow, show the actual building—it cannot, like York and Ripon, show historical notices and a few abiding fragments—it cannot even, like Winchester, show an elaborate poetical description, of a church four hundred or one hundred years older than the Norman Conquest. We have seen that in 1058 Ealdred dedicated a church which he had from the foundations, and we know that there was a church earlier than his. This is all that we can say; even of Ealdred's church we have no description. We are told indeed, on no very good authority,³ though the statement is in itself in no way unlikely, that the church of Ealdred stood on a different

¹ The cellarer Odo became a monk in 1077, and, according to the *Chartulary*, (i., 11) did much for the increase of the possessions of the abbey. Peter the prior (i., 13) succeeded Serlo in the abbacy on his death in 1104.

² According to the *Chartulary*, Osric was buried "in ecclesia sancti Petri coram altari sanctæ Petronillæ in aquilonari parte ejusdem monasterii, anno Domini septingentesimo vicesimo nono." *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 5.

³ In the "*Memoriale Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Gloucestriæ Compendiarium*," in the *Monasticon*, i., 564: "Edwardi Confessoris tempore, Aldredus Wigornensis episcopus ejusdem ecclesiæ novum inchoavit fundamentum, a loco quo prius steterat paullo remotius et urbis lateri magis contiguum."

site from the earlier church, and nearer to the wall of the city. This statement is slightly puzzling. The existing church is something more than near to the Roman wall.¹ It actually stands over its north-west corner. It is not as at Lincoln, at Le Mans, and at Bourges, where the church was built near to but within the wall, and where later enlargements of the church called for the destruction of part of the wall. Gloucester abbey, as it now stands, both the church and the conventual buildings, seems to have been built without any regard to the Roman wall, as if that wall had already passed away. The greater part of the conventual buildings, the gateway, the abbot's house on the other side of the small and now hidden stream, part of the cloister and of the buildings round the cloister, all lie outside of the line of ancient Glevum. And they not only lie outside of it; they lie in a manner on both sides of it; they lie round that north-west angle of the *chester* which the minster itself actually covers. Where then stood the church that was before Ealdred? Within or without the wall? The elder site, it is implied, was further from the wall; did Ealdred bring it nearer to its outer or to its inner face? This question is by no means easy to answer, and it is further complicated by another. Does the present church of Gloucester or any part of it stand on the site of the church of Ealdred? By the time when the oldest church of which we have any part remaining came into being, the Roman wall, or at least this corner of it, must have pretty well passed away. And this looks as if it had done so long before. For though the site of the church may have been changed, though it may even have been twice changed, the change would not be to any great distance. It would be translated only from one part of the ecclesiastical precinct to another. I can give no positive answer to the question; but it may well be that the unusual, though not unique, position of the conventual buildings at Gloucester, on the north side of the church, may have had something to do with these changes in the site of the church itself.

¹ See the plan of Glevum in Mr. Bellows' paper on the Ancient Wall of Gloucester, *Proceedings of the Cotteswold Field Club*, vol. vi., p. 171.

The first thing that we do know for certain is that, in the year 1089, thirty-one years only after the dedication of Ealdred's church, Serlo, the first Norman abbot, began the building of a new church, which was itself dedicated in 1100.¹ In this building there is no reason to think that any part of Ealdred's church was preserved; it may even have been on a different site, as we know to have been the case with Saint Wulfstan's church at Worcester. Now why was there a re-building of a church which was still almost new? Professor Willis was misled into thinking that it was, as at Canterbury and York, because of a fire in 1087.² But I have shown that there is no evidence for any such fire; and only a few years later, the church of Gloucester was burned once or twice, without feeling any need to be re-built on that account. The reason is not very far to seek for any one who has really mastered the history of architecture during the eleventh century. I need not go through that history for the thousandth time. I must beg to refer, once for all, to the architectural chapter in my fifth volume.³ The simple fact is that the Norman prelates pulled down and rebuilt the English churches mainly because they thought them too small. But the fact that

¹ The work of Serlo is recorded by Florence, 1100, "Idibus Julii die Dominica, ecclesia, quam venerandæ memoriæ abbas Serlo a fundamentis construxerat Glawornæ, ab episcopis Samsone Wigornensi, Gundulfo Hrofensi, Gerardo Herefordensi, et Herveo Bancornensi, dedicata est magno cum honore." It was therefore (see *Will. Ruf.*, ii., 517) while the church was in its first freshness, and the minds of its inmates even doubtless in a special fervour of devotion, that the vision was seen and the sermon preached which foretold the fall of the Red King. William of Malmesbury has two panegyrics on Serlo, to some extent in the same words; *Gesta Regum*, v. 441, *Gesta Pontificum*, iv., 155, "Et, ne Anglia expers boni putetur, quis possit præterire Serlonem abbatem Glocestrensem, qui locum illum ex humili et pene nullo ad gloriosum provectum extulit? Nota est omnibus Anglis Glocestrensis discretæ religio, quam infirmus possit suspicere, nec possit fortis centemnere." According to William of Malmesbury, Serlo found only three monks. The *Chartulary* reckons "duos ibi tantum perfectæ ætatis monachos et circiter octavos juvenes parvos." This is brought in the *Gesta Pontificum* with an eloquent panegyric on Gloucester and Gloucestershire, and William here adds the history of Saint Oswald's, whose canons, it seemed, complained that Archbishop Thomas had given their lands to the monks of Saint Peters.

² *Archæological Journal*, xvii., 335.

³ *Norman Conquest*, cap. xxvi.

Ealdred's church was thought too small, and was therefore pulled down, proves something about it. It proves that, of the two types of church which were in use side by side in the days of the Confessor, Ealdred had followed the elder type. He had not conformed to the new Norman fashions, vast size among them, which were coming in after the example of the King's own church at Westminster. He had, like Earl Odda at Deerhurst, stuck to the older traditions of the country, to the smaller scale and the closer following of Italian models. His church in fact was built in the Primitive Romanesque style, the style common to England with Germany, Italy, and Burgundy, not in the newly-developed Norman style of northern Gaul. Therefore neither its scale nor its style suited the ideas of Abbot Serlo. It was condemned, and the minster that now stands was begun. Eleven years later, in the last year of the reign of William Rufus, the last year of the eleventh century, the new church of Saint Peter of Gloucester stood ready for its hallowing.

I have said already that, in my judgement at least, there is no reason to think that any part of the church of Ealdred was preserved in the rebuilding by Serlo. It is needful to say a word or two on this head, because there are appearances in the crypt which have been taken, and not without plausibility, as signs that in that part of the church we have, not an original work of Serlo, but a work of Ealdred recast by Serlo. Now it is quite certain that there is in the crypt work of two dates, of two Norman dates, not counting the great props, of the fourteenth century or later, which were carried down into the crypt to support the new work on the upper floor. There are arches built in under other arches, and imposts which hide or disguise earlier imposts. And in the central walk of the crypt, there are small columns which have been thought to belong to an earlier date than the main vault and its supports, to be in short part of Ealdred's work preserved or used up again by Serlo. But though there are manifestly two different dates of Norman work, though it is plain that there has been some change since the earliest work in the crypt was begun, there is no reason to think that this difference marks any real difference of date. The local chronicle records an

earthquake during the time when Serlo's work was going on,¹ and it is far more likely that the work, while still imperfect, was damaged by the earthquake, and that the changes that are now to be seen simply mark the repairs which were thus made needful. The capitals which have been looked on as Ealdred's are Norman, though early Norman. I have already said that Ealdred's church, consecrated in 1058, might easily have been in the early Norman style, but that the mere fact of its rebuilding seems to show that it was not. At all events there is no need to think that the capitals are his, nor can I see any special temptation to think so. The local knowledge of Florence, whose English feelings would surely have been well pleased to record the survival of any part of the English fabric, is witness enough that, short as was the time that Ealdred's church had stood, it altogether gave way to the creation of Serlo.

At this point there comes a very important question, How much of the church was built at the time of the dedication in the year 1100? It is sometimes assumed that in all these cases it was only a fragment that was first consecrated; that the parts absolutely needful for the monastic services, the presbytery and choir, were finished and consecrated, and that then the rest of the building was carried on more leisurely. And there is no doubt that this often was the case. But it is just as clear that in many other churches another rule was followed, and that the building that was consecrated was a church complete in all its parts. It was clearly so with Eadward's church at Westminster and with Lanfranc's church at Canterbury.² It was clearly so with the Conqueror's church at Caen; it was seemingly not so with the church of his queen.³ Without laying down any strict rule either way, it is plain that, when a church was altogether new without any predecessor, and again when a church was gradually

¹ *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 11. "Et eodem anno, iii. idus Augusti, factus est terræ-motus."

² See the passages from Eadmer and William of Malmesbury, commented on in *Norman Conquest*, iv., 359.

³ See *Norman Conquest*, iii., 107.

rebuilt on its old site, it was convenient to have some part ready for divine service as soon as might be, while, when a church was rebuilt on a new site, as Saint Wulfstan rebuilt the church of Worcester, the old church could remain in use till the new one was thoroughly completed. When I say "thoroughly completed" I do not necessarily mean brought to an ideal perfection in every point. It might be left to a future time to carry up the towers to their full height, and, for good constructive reasons, it commonly was left to a future time to add the stone vault, where a stone vault was designed. I mean that the ground-plan was completed, that all the essential parts of a church were there, transepts and nave, no less than presbytery and choir. Now under which of these rules did the church of Gloucester come? Eleven years is perhaps quite long enough for its building, when we remember that Lanfranc built Christ Church in seven years, and that it took William of Saint-Calais only three years to build the eastern limb and lantern-space of Durham abbey, with the eastern sides of the transepts, and so much of the nave as to form a gigantic buttress.¹ Now there is no hint in the local chronicle of any additions being made to the building dedicated in 1100. It is singular that two fires, in 1101 and in 1122, are recorded, by national as by local writers, to have burned the city and monastery of Gloucester, and it is distinctly said that the church was burned.² But every one who is used to the language of these times knows with what wonderful laxity phrases like these are used. Doubtless some damage was done; the wooden roof might be burned off, and the lead on it—if there was any lead—melted; but the church itself was not burned down; at least if it was, it is passing strange

¹ See the passages quoted in *Norman Conquest*, v., 631.

² Florence, 1101. "Civitas Glaworna cum principali monasterio, et aliis viii. idus jun. feria quinta, incendio conflagravit." The *Chartulary*, i., 12, places this in 1102. The burning in 1122 is recorded by Florence and in the *Chartulary*; but we have a minute account of it in the *Chronicle* itself. "And on þone Lenten tyde þær toforen forbearn se burch on Gleawecestre þa hwile þe þa munecas sungen þære messe, and se dæne hafde ongunnan þone godspel P'terrens Ihc þa com se fir on fenweard þone stepel and forbearde ealle þe minstre and ealle þa gersumes þe þær binnen wæron fuoruton feawe bec and iii. mæssehekeles. þæt wes þes dæis viij. iii. Idus Mr."

that there is no notice of the rebuilding of any part of the church. It is still less needful to show that nothing can be inferred from the fact that in 1239 the church was dedicated, in obedience to the general order for the dedication of all churches that remained undedicated.¹ Nobody can fancy that either the Norman choir or the Norman nave was then newly built. If the nave was not built before 1100, it was built in the twelfth century, and early in the twelfth century. And, if it was not built before 1100, its building is strictly unrecorded. At Durham, for instance, we have the distinct record of the carrying on of the work to a certain point by William of Saint-Calais, and of its completion in after times. Here the dedication under Serlo is our only guide till much later times. We have to suppose that all mention of so important a work as the building of the nave is left out in a chronicle which seems carefully to enter all other changes of the fabric. On the other hand the appearance of the building itself might lead us to think that the eastern and western limbs could not possibly be parts of the same work. There is little or no difference of style; but there is every difference of design. The eastern limb follows the usual proportion of an early Norman minster with low arcades and a triforium. The nave is utterly different. Vast round pillars of most unusual height, far higher than those even of Durham, support a small triforium and clerestory. The contrast is most marked. Either the nave was built very soon after the presbytery, by another architect whose ideas were wholly different from those of the architect of the presbytery, or else the single architect of the two sought to startle all beholders by making the greatest possible contrast in design between the two main parts of his building. It may throw some light upon the matter if we compare the church of Gloucester with its neighbour, in many points its fellow, at Tewkesbury. At the present moment the general effect of the two minsters, not taking in the difference of scale, has much more of contrast than likeness. Outside we might almost say that they have nothing in common, except the presence of polygonal chapels round the east end, and

¹ See Matthew Paris, iii., 638., ed. Luard.

even there those at Gloucester are part of the original work, while at Tewkesbury they have been rebuilt. Tewkesbury keeps its apse, while at Gloucester the apse has given way to the hugest of east windows. Tewkesbury keeps its vast Norman mid-tower, which at Gloucester has given way to two successors, in turn, of the thirteenth and of the fifteenth century. The west fronts we cannot compare; it may be that the great western arch of Tewkesbury had a fellow at Gloucester: but, if so, the position between the two towers must have given it a different, and, we may feel sure, a better effect within.

The first thing at Tewkesbury that strikes us is the crushing effect of lowness, which we do not feel even in the nave of Gloucester, while the eastern limb is one of the loftiest in England. At Gloucester the whole eastern limb has been veiled with work of a later date; at Tewkesbury the ancient piers remain undisguised, with work of an intermediate date built upon them. But most of these differences are due to the later changes in the two churches having taken quite different courses. It is easy to see that the original Romanesque churches must have had very much in common, and that in some points Gloucester and Tewkesbury must have agreed—they still do agree—with one another, and differed from all other churches everywhere else. The apparent lowness of Tewkesbury is largely due, partly to its great proportional breadth, but much more to the way in which the later vaulting of the nave has been put on, which goes far to hide the clerestory, and which brings the roof far too low down. One of the most singular features of the interior at Gloucester, one on which we shall have presently to comment at length, is that the effect of a central lantern is almost wholly got rid of. As the church now stands, this is directly owing to the changes of the fourteenth century; but a comparison with Tewkesbury will show that the peculiarity was suggested by the character of the original building. It would be hard to find a Romanesque church where the central tower has so little of the effect of a central lantern as it has at Tewkesbury. The choir was of course under the tower; but the architect was so bent on making a choir that he almost forgot that there was to be a tower over it. In order to gain a better backing

for stalls, the eastern and western arches of the tower spring from a flat wall, no projection at all being given to their supports. So it is at Tewkesbury; it is easy to see that it must have been the same at Gloucester also. East and west of the lantern, the same contrast between the two parts of the Romanesque building, which is so striking at Gloucester, is to be seen at Tewkesbury also. Thoroughly recast as the whole eastern limb has been, it is easy to see that there too the Norman church had the low pier, and therefore doubtless the large triforium. The nave, on the other hand, shows the peculiarities of the Gloucester nave in a still more exaggerated degree. The huge pillars at Tewkesbury have become everything; the clerestory is very small, the triforium is shouldered almost out of being. Small at Gloucester, it is less at Tewkesbury; it has sunk to a series of distinct pairs of small arches. Are we to hold that the Gloucester nave is the elder, that the nave of Tewkesbury is the work of the same architect as that of Gloucester, or of some other architect who admired his work, and that the later building purposely shows the peculiarities of the elder, carried to a still further extreme? Or are we to think that Tewkesbury is the older, that the architect of Gloucester, whether the same or another, admired the tall massive pillars of Tewkesbury, but thought that the triforium and clerestory had been rather hardly treated, and sought therefore in his later work to bring them back to a somewhat greater measure of importance? Some direct connexion there cannot fail to be, when, in so very important a feature, two neighbouring minsters stand together and stand pretty well apart from all others. This feature of amazing height given to the pillars, a height which goes far in the massive Romanesque to forestall the light Perpendicular of three hundred years later, reminds us somewhat of Tournus and of Saint Abbondio at Como; but it will hardly be found so thoroughly carried out in any other great English church as it is in these two. I cannot say that I admire it; to my eye the creator of the matchless pile at Durham hit on exactly the right proportion for the style which he first carried to perfection. But there it is at Gloucester and Tewkesbury, and hardly anywhere else, and at Tewkesbury in a measure which

leaves Gloucester far behind. This fact is certainly not accidental; the two neighbouring churches must have been building at the same time, and the founder of one was a chief benefactor of the other.

The dates in Tewkesbury history that concern us for this purpose are two. The monks entered the new monastery in 1102, and the church was consecrated in 1122.¹ This almost looks as if the former entry referred only to the monks taking possession of their domestic quarters, leaving the church to be built within the next twenty years. Yet it is perhaps not necessary to adopt this view. The word "monasterium," without being necessarily confined to that meaning, has a great tendency to mean the church, sometimes in direct distinction from the other buildings. And the works of Robert Fitz-hamon at Tewkesbury are spoken of in language which would seem rather out of place if he did not even begin the chief building of all.² And Robert Fitz-hamon is not likely to have done much anywhere after 1106. For in that year he received a wound in the wars of Normandy, which did not take away his life, but which seems to have left him for the rest of his days helpless in mind and body.³ Again, in the west front of Tewkesbury we see one of those singular bits of evidence which show that the Norman builders, while bringing in their new architectural fashions, did not scruple sometimes to adopt the earlier fashions of the conquered island. The massive round pillar so characteristic of English Norman is, I feel sure, a

¹ *Annals of Tewkesbury*, *Ann. Mon.*, i., 44, 1102. "Hic primum in novum monasterium ingressi sumus." It is added, "et ecclesia sancti Petri Gloucestræ igne cremata. Obiit Serlo abbas Gloucestræ."

² Will. Malmes, *Gest. Reg.*, v., 398. "Robertus monasterium Theoces-biriæ suo favore non facile memoratu quantum exaltant et ædificiorum decor, et monachorum charitas, adventantium rapit oculos et allicit animos." William hopes that this exaltation of Tewkesbury might be some atonement for the burning of the church of Bayeux, which was done seemingly, not by Robert himself, but by King Henry on his behalf.

³ William had said just before, "conto iotus tempora, hebetatusque ingenio, non paucio tempore quasi captus mente supervixit." This was his punishment for the sacrilege at Bayeux.

feature which the Norman builders in England borrowed from the older national style; but, at Tewkesbury, as at Saint Albans, as at Oxford, we see in works of Norman date, of the foundation of men of Norman birth, details which still more distinctively belong to the earlier day. These are the baluster-shafts in the turrets which seem to carry us back to Earls Barton, and even to Monkwearmouth. There, the last finish of the west front, must be in date about the latest Romanesque work in the church. And surely so primitive a feature is more likely to belong to a building of 1102 than to a building of 1122, when the earlier Norman forms had begun to pass away under the improvements of Bishop Roger of Salisbury.¹ And, though the dedication in 1122 certainly suggests that the church was then only newly finished, it does not prove that it was. The order of 1239, for the dedication of churches which remained undedicated, an order to which we shall have again to refer, shows that the ceremony was often strangely delayed. I am therefore on the whole inclined to believe—though I stand ready to be changed to any other belief by the smallest amount of positive evidence—that the churches of Gloucester and Tewkesbury both belong to the reign of William Rufus and to the last years of the eleventh century, rather than to the reign of Henry the First and to the first years of the twelfth. The history of the two cannot be kept asunder. The two churches were in building at the same time, and both show the same peculiarity; both follow the usual proportion of the time in the eastern part, both forsake it in the western part for a proportion peculiar or nearly so to these two churches. That the church of Gloucester was built on a larger scale than that of Tewkesbury, that it had the finish of western towers which Tewkesbury had not, is the natural result of the greater wealth of Gloucester. The churches were building at the same time, and, as there must be a reason for the points of likeness, there must be a reason for the points of unlikeness. The

¹ I have spoken of the works of Roger of Salisbury, *Norman Conquest*, v., 638. The great passage is William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum*, v., 408, where he describes Roger's buildings as "aedificia spatio diffusa, numero pecuniarum sumptuosa, specie formosissima; ita iuste composito ordine lapidum ut iunctura perstringat intuitum, ei totam maceriam unum mentiatur esse saxum."

two buildings cannot fail to have influenced one another. Either the nave of Tewkesbury is an exaggeration of the nave of Gloucester, or the nave of Gloucester is a softening down, so to speak, of the nave of Tewkesbury. On the whole, the former seems the more likely conjecture of the two.

The two churches of Gloucester and Tewkesbury are brought together by the connexion of both with a prominent man of the time, who was at Gloucester merely a benefactor to a church which already held a high position, while at Tewkesbury, confused and puzzling as is the early history of the house, it is plain that he may claim the rank of at least a second founder. This is Robert Fitz-hamon, lord of Gloucester, lord of Glamorgan, father-in-law of a lord of Gloucester and Glamorgan more famous than himself. He had so much to do both with Gloucester and with Tewkesbury that it is hard to avoid the guess that the singular analogies in the style of the two minsters are owing to his taste or that of his architect. However this may be, he fills a great place in local history, both at Gloucester and elsewhere. A favourite both of William Rufus and of Henry the First, he belongs wholly to their generation; he plays no part in the reign of William the Great. The Gloucester and Gloucestershire entries in Domesday do not contain his name, nor does he appear, as his brother Hamon does at Colchester, in any other part of the Survey. A good many other Normans appear as holding houses in Gloucester; but they hardly number among them any man of first-rate importance. One however we find whom we should hardly have looked for, the Norman-born but English-minded Bishop Osbern of Exeter.¹ With regard to the state of the city, the royal dues, at least as regarded payments in money, had been, as in so many other places, raised by the Conqueror. To King Edward Gloucester had paid thirty-six pounds; to King William it paid sixty. But then it might almost seem that the increased money payment was, in part at least, a composition for payments

¹ *Domesday*, 162. "Osbernus episcopus tenet terram et mansiones quas Edmarus tenuit. Reddit x solidos cum alia consuetudine," and again, "Osbernus episcopus i mansionem de xli denariis." I have spoken of him, *Norman Conquest*, iv., 373.

in kind which had been made to the native king, for the honey, the dickers of iron, the bars of iron to make nails for the King's ships, a fitting tribute for a city which stood so near to the Forest of Dean.¹ But for my purpose it is of more importance that a castle arose, which involved the destruction of sixteen houses, besides fourteen houses which lay waste.² This was a small measure of destruction compared with what happened at Oxford and in some other cities. Gloucester, we may at least infer, was not taken by storm.

The name of Robert Fitz-hamon leads us almost naturally back to the name of Brihtric son of Ælfgar, the Englishman whose lands passed so largely, though not directly, into his hands. We are not called on now to discuss the romantic tale about Brihtric and Queen Matilda, how the love of the Flemish princess, rejected by the Englishman, turned to hatred, how, when her turn came, she took vengeance on the man who had scorned her, and procured his imprisonment and the confiscation of his lands. One feature of the legend is strange enough. Matilda is not set before us as doing all this with her own hands; she employs the King her husband as her tool. Now it is not quite like William the Great to be made use of in this kind of way, even by his own wife; and one cannot help thinking that he might have been better pleased if his wife had shown herself utterly indifferent to Brihtric than he could have been at finding that another man still occupied, after any fashion, so large a share of her thoughts. The story in short is one of those which we cannot take upon ourselves positively to deny, but of which we may safely say that they rest on no sufficient evidence. What is really certain is that Brihtric was a great land-owner in these parts and in other parts, and that his lands, both here and elsewhere, had a strong tendency to pass into the hands of Queen Matilda. This would be strong corroborative evidence for a story which had any decent direct

¹ The payments made by the city of Gloucester are given in *Domesday*, 162. The most notable are "xii sextaria mellis ad mensuram ejusdem burgi et xxxvi dicras ferri et c virgas ferreas ductiles ad clavos navium regis."

² *Domesday*, 162. "Sedecim domus erant ubi sedet castellum, quae modo desunt, et in burgo civitatis sunt wastatae xiiii. domus."

evidence to start with ; but here the authority for the story is on the very weakest, and it is just as likely that the tale grew up to account for the fact that Matilda held so large a share of Brihtric's lands.

But, if the lands of Brihtric had a tendency to pass into the hands, first of Queen Matilda, and then of Robert Fitz-hamon, that tendency was shared by more distant lands to which neither Brihtric nor Matilda had ever made a claim. The founder of Tewkesbury, the benefactor of Gloucester, was also the conqueror of Glamorgan, and the churches of South Wales had no call to look on him as either founder or benefactor. In them he found an easy means of being munificent at the cost of others. The venerable foundations of the Briton were employed to increase the wealth of houses in England to which they were a source of wealth and nothing more. Among several others the famous churches of Saint Cadoc at Llanearfan and of Saint Iltud at Llantwit became a possession of the monks of Gloucester, and Llanearfan is spoken of over and over again in this chartulary.¹ The renowned son-in-law and successor of Robert Fitz-hamon, the greatest of the lords of Glamorgan, the first of the Earls of Gloucester, Robert, the son of King Henry, practised the same kind of spurious bounty, and further enriched the great church of his earldom and city with the spiritual spoils of the helpless Briton.² Other possessions of the same kind, gifts of benefactors of historic name, were added to the vast belongings of the house of Saint Peter. Among them, among the dependent priories of the great abbey, we find the precious church of Saint Michael at Ewenny, the fortified church, the divided church, with

¹ The entries about Llanearfan are endless. The earliest is in the *History*, i., 93. "Robertus filius Hamonis dedit ecclesiam Sancti Cadoci de Lanearvan Deo et ecclesie Sancti Petri Gloucestrie et Penhon quindecim hidas terræ, rege Willelmo confirmante, tempore Serlonis abbatis."

² We have a list of Earl Robert's gifts in the *History*, i., 115. "Robertus comes Gloucestrie dedit ecclesie Sancti Petri Gloucestrie Treygof. Idem Robertus comes Gloucestrie, filius regis, dedit monachis Sancti Petri Gloucestrie Treygof et Penhon, cum aliis pertinentiis suis. Insuper quietos eos fecit, et homines suos, insuper et prioratum de Ewenny a tholoneo per totam terram suam, tempore Walteri de Lacy abbatis."

its barrel-vaulted choir carrying our thoughts to Clermont and Toulouse, that now unique monument, more precious in its decay than Arundel and Dunster, where the "restorer" has so successfully laboured to wipe out the great historic features. Maurice of London—the chartulary keeps the Latin or English form rather than the more usual *Londres*—is the giver, and Earl Robert confirms the gift.¹ More distant still, not in almost neighbouring Morganwg, but far away by the Atlantic shore of Cardigan, Gilbert of Clare gave the church of Llanbadarn, once the seat of an ancient British bishopric, to become another cell of the house of Saint Peter of Gloucester.² Not fully in the British land, but close on its march, Harold, son of Ralph—Ralph of Mantes, the timid earl of King Eadward's day—Harold of Ewias, was the giver of another dependent priory in his own castle. The grant is an instructive document, signed, as becomes a charter drawn up so near to the border, by a crowd of witnesses, whose names stamp them as belonging to the various races of the land, British, English, and Norman.³ The abbey even acquired dependencies in another city. As the abbey of Battle held patronage at Exeter, as the Archbishops of

¹ Ewenny and its priory is mentioned in the *History and Chartulary* over and over again. In ii. 11, we find the grant of Maurice of London confirmed by Earl Robert.

² The grant of Llanbadarn appears in i., 106. "Anno Domini millesimo centesimo undecimo, Gilbertus filius Ricardi, unus de præcipuis Angliæ principibus, dedit ecclesiæ Sancti Petri Gloucestricæ terram et ecclesiam Sancti Paterni in Wallia." In the full charter in ii., 73, we find that the grant was made "ad prioratum construendum apud Sanctum Paternum."

³ The grant of Ewias by Harold son of Ralph, also comes over and over again. The signatures to the grant of the church of Saint Michael come in i., 286. They are a wonderful study of nomenclature. High up we find "Daniel decanus, Nicholas Kenegain, et frater ejus Bledien; Radulphus capellanus; Selid et Joseph sacerdotes." Towards the end we light upon "Rogerus Walensis," while the list ends with a most instructive gathering of men of various races, "Rogerus filius Deod, Goffridus filius Davidis, Ricardus de Croilli, Walterus cum barba, Aluredus de Lecche, Geroldus de Ledene, Rogerus Cailli, Wluricus Mordefrater, Radulfus de Overe, Celemon, Meinardus, cum aliis." One would specially like to know something more of "Wulfric Mordefrater," though we can hardly think that his record was creditable.

York held patronage in Gloucester itself, so Walter of Lacy gave to Saint Peter of Gloucester the priory of Saint Peter or Saint Guthlac in the castle of Hereford.¹ Another dependent house on the border arose at Kilpeck, where we still see the traces of the castle and one of the most enriched of the smaller churches of the twelfth century, by the gift of a certain Hugh whose father is described as *Willelmus Normannus*.² Are we in this to see simply a William born in Normandy, a definition which in that generation must have fitted a good many dwellers in England? Or, though to some the suggestion may sound like a paradox, does the name *Normannus* in truth rather mark a man of English birth, a namesake of Northman, son of Earl Leofwine and brother of Earl Leofric?³ We see the advance, not only of the abbey of Gloucester, but of the Benedictine rule generally, when, by the authority of Archbishop Theobald and of Gilbert Foliot Bishop of Hereford—once himself Abbot of Gloucester and to be Bishop of London—the canons of Bromfield in his diocese surrender their church to the abbey of Gloucester, and themselves become monks under its obedience.⁴ And nearer home, by the gift of Roger of Berkeley—of the elder house of Berkeley before the coming of Robert the son of Harding the son of Eadnoth—Leonard Stanley, with its admirable specimen of a Norman conventual church of the smallest type, was added to the tale of dependent priories which looked up to the great abbey. Thus, in the course of the twelfth century, the house of Saint Peter had waxed rich and powerful; it had become

¹ See the grant of Saint Guthlac or Saint Peter at Hereford in i., 84, 85. In i., 42, is an instructive document of Abbot Thoky in 1317, touching the relations of all these dependent priories.

² "Hugo filius Willelmi Normanni" appears as the giver of Kilpeck in i., 91, and as a witness to the grant of Ewias in i., 286.

³ On the name I would refer to *William Rufus* i., 140, where I have noticed a curious misconception of Thierry's.

⁴ The cession of Bromfield in 1155 appears in i., 19, 66. "Canonici de Bromfeld dederunt ecclesiam suam et se ipsos ad monachatum ecclesiæ Sancti Petri Gloucestræ." In the second entry the phrase is more singular: "Dederunt ecclesiam suam et seipsos Sancto Petro Gloucestræ ibi monachari."

the centre of a crowd of subordinate houses, specially in the British land and its borders. Gloucester became in some sort the ecclesiastical head of the neighbouring lands of South Wales, somewhat to the wrong of their natural mother church at Llandaff. When Robert, once Duke of the Normans, died in Earl Robert's castle of Cardiff, it was to the city which formed the earldom of his keeper that his body was brought for burial.¹ He who had reigned at Rouen, who might have reigned at Jerusalem, but of whom England thrice said in a voice that none could mistake, "We will not have this man to reign over us," came in death as a kind of tribute paid by the dependent land to its spiritual mistress. And Gloucester and the coasts thereof presently found another tie to bind them to the British land. As if to retaliate the spiritual invasions of the Benedictines of Gloucester, the Austin canons of Llanthony, cruelly translated from Colchester to the deep valley of the Honddû, made their escape from this mountain prison to find a home that better suited them beneath the walls of Gloucester, almost within the shadows of its minster towers.²

I need hardly say that, in gathering together these few details, I have had the History and Chartulary of the abbey published in the Chronicles and Memorials,—the Chartulary which is attributed to Abbot Frocester, and which seems at least to have been put together in his day, always at hand. Like all documents of the kind, it has a value beyond its direct local value. In this and other such records we get constant pictures of the times, all the more valuable because they are undesigned. The Gloucester history is, till we come near to the days of the compiler, that is till the compiler becomes the original writer, less lively reading

¹ The local entry runs thus: "Anno Domini millesimo centesimo tricesimo quarto obiit dominus Robertus Curtehorse, comes Normaniz, filius regis Willelmi conquestoris, tertio nonas Februarii, apud castrum de Kerdiff. Sed in ecclesia Sancti Petri Gloucestriz honorifice coram principali altari sepelitur." *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 15.

² The new Llanthony by Gloucester often appears in the *History and Chartulary*. In i., 140, there is a kind of treaty between the monasteries of Gloucester, Llanthony, Worcester, and Cirencester, but it is of a much more worldly kind than the treaty between Wulfstan, Serlo and their fellows T. R. W.

than some other monastic records, but it is full of knowledge to those who know how to use it. Mr. Seebohm, I see, has made good use of it to illustrate the mediæval tenures of land; I have made some use of it to illustrate the history of personal nomenclature. Of the purely local interest I need not speak; that is plain to everyone who knows anything of Gloucester or Gloucestershire. And, as having once been a seven years inhabitant of the shire, I am often well pleased to find in the chartulary notices of places which were once familiar to me. When I come to Lettice of Dursley, of whom all I can say is that her land joined that of Richard of Slymbridge, and when I find a document witnessed by Peris of Stinchcombe—the tongue is French, and I presume he was Peter—I feel among old neighbours.¹

But I must go back, of course with the Chartulary before me, to the history of the abbey, and above all of the fabric of its church. We see the minster of Saint Peter, showing outside the usual outline of a Norman minster, the apse with its surrounding chapels, oddly enough polygonal in shape, the mid-tower over the choir, the lesser towers flanking the west front. Within we see one of the most striking contrasts to be anywhere seen between two parts of the same building which differ not at all in architectural style, and which cannot differ more than a few years in actual date. The flat wooden ceiling, such as we see at Peterborough and Saint Albans, covers all the four limbs. Of any change in the fabric in the course of the twelfth century the local history tells us nothing. And yet it is strange that it should have nothing to tell. For we have entries, and those entries, beside recording grants to the abbey and giving occasional notices of national events, seem to deal mainly with the endless fires which vexed church and city, but which do not seem to

¹ The abbey grants "Willelmo Touche de Slymbrugge, tres acras terræ arabilis in villa de Cleyhangre quas Walterus filius Ricardi de Slymbrigge nobis dedit et carta sua confirmavit, et quarum quidem una acra jacet juxta terram Galfridi de Allewelle ex parte unæ terram Lætitiæ de Durseleya." Peris appears to have been an honourable person, if not a knight; he comes in a list of witnesses described as *sires*, and along with him are put "Robert de Berkele, Johan de Gloucestre, Johan de Ollepenne." *Hist. et Cart.*, ii., 218.

have led to any re-building of the fabric. At this stage, with a single exception, we do not get such living pictures of the abbots and monks of Gloucester as we do of the abbots and monks of Saint Albans. Abbot Walter of Lacy lives in a picture clearly drawn by a contemporary, but of the famous Gilbert Foliot we hear far less than we should have looked for. Yet Gloucester has its local story. Like most other Christian cities, it had its tale of the Christian child tortured to death by Jews. The fate of Hugh of Lincoln, of William of York, of William Norwich, was also in 1168 the fate of the boy Harold of Gloucester.¹ But the tale is told in a somewhat unusual tone, as if the chronicler had less undoubting faith than he ought to have had. And, taking the story as it stands, there really seems very little evidence to bring the crime home to the Jews beyond the assumption that none but Jews were likely to do it. The young martyr, whose very name keeps on English memories, was buried in the minster before the altars of two English saints, Saint Eadmund and Saint Eadward.

The name of a special votary of those English saints, whose reverence for them was in truth the only English thing about him, presently stamps itself in a marked way on the history of Gloucester. Many as were the times that kings had held their court at Gloucester, it was only once that the minster of Saint Peter beheld the crowning of a king. While the church of Serlo—if Serlo's it all be—was still untouched in its main features, the young Henry the Third received the kingly unction within its walls from the hands of the Poitevin Bishop of Winchester, Peter des Roches.² The two great

¹ The story is told in the *History* at great length under the year 1168. Some of the expressions are remarkable: "A Judæis furtim plurimorum opinione, nono kalendas Martii sublatus fertur," and presently: "nullus quippe Christianus interfuit qui vel pœnas ejusdem vidisset aut audisset nec ab ullo Judæo quicquid inde comperimus proditum fuisse." The child's body is said to have shewn signs of various kinds of torture; but there is no direct evidence against the Jews, nor yet any miracle pointing them out as the doers.

² The coronation of October 28, 1216, is duly entered in the *History* i., 24.

churches of the Hwicceian land came at that moment into special prominence; the guilty father was buried at Worcester, the as yet innocent son was crowned at Gloucester. The next time that a childish Henry received a crown from a Bishop of Winchester, it was in another land, and under circumstances exactly opposite. We can hardly venture to compare this somewhat irregular crowning at Gloucester in 1216 with the great and solemn crowning at Rheims in 1429. Yet, as one marked the crushing of the hopes of a French prince in England, the other marked the crushing of the hopes of an English prince in France. Lewis went back crownless; and the crown that was set at Paris on the head of young Henry the Sixth was vainly set indeed, when the holy oil of Remigius had already about done its work and had changed the King of Bourges into the King of France.

I said that at the time of Henry's crowning the church of Serlo was still untouched in its main features. Had we only the local chronicle to turn to, I might have said that it was wholly untouched. But an incidental reference in quite another quarter enables us to say that, before the coronation, one of the original towers had fallen, and it is not clear whether it had been rebuilt. Giraldus Cambrensis, in his life of Roger Bishop of Worcester,¹ who sat from 1164 to 1179, tells how the Bishop was one day saying mass at the high altar of Gloucester abbey, how, at the most solemn moment of the service, a large and tall tower at the west end of the church fell to the earth by the force of an earthquake. That is the fact that concerns us; the story is told to show the pious calmness of the bishop, who, amidst the noise, the dust, the confusion, men, women, and monks themselves, running hither and thither

¹ Giraldus Cambrensis, vii., 64, ed. Dimock: "Contigit aliquando, praesule Rogero apud Gloverniam in Monasterio S. Petri et principali altari missam celebrante, turrem ecclesiae amplam et altam, vitio fundamenti, subito ad terram ipsa confectionis hora corruisse." The description which follows of the behaviour of the monks in the choir and of the bishop at the high altar would alone show that a west tower is meant. But the distinct statement presently follows: "Cum enim turris illa in ultima et occidua ecclesiae parte stetisset, omnes ea hora tam mulieres quam mares versus altare principale propter benedictionem episcopalem appropinquaverant, sicut pia fuerat Salvatoris dispositione provisum."

to save themselves—nobody in fact was hurt—went on with the mass unmoved. Giraldus does not tell us whether it was the north-western or the south-western tower; but we shall presently come to some entries in the local history which may throw some light on this question. These entries, hardly to be found in the twelfth century, are thick on the ground in the thirteenth. The earliest after the coronation comes in 1222, and records the building of the great eastern tower of the church of Gloucester by the work of the sacrist Helias of Hereford, whose death is recorded in 1237.¹ Two years after the building of the tower, comes the building of the Lady chapel in the churchyard by the gift of Ralph of Willington, a person who is several times mentioned in the cartulary, and whose wife bore a name borrowed from the royal house of Molottis, being a namesake of Olympias, mother of Alexander.² In 1239, as has been already mentioned, came a dedication of the church, in obedience to the general order which commanded the dedication of all churches which still remained undedicated. And at that dedication the chief minister was a memorable one, no other than the bishop of the diocese, Walter of Cantelupe, the patriot prelate who, six-and-twenty years later, stood by Earl Simon on the day of martyrdom at Evesham. Three years after this great rite the vault over the nave was made, not, like other works, by the hands of hired craftsmen, but by those of the monks themselves.³ In 1242 we read that the

¹ *Hist. et Cart. i.*, 25: "Anno Domini millesimo ducentesimo vicesimo secundo magna turris Gloucestrensis ecclesiæ orientalis, auxiliante Helia ejusdem monasterii sacrista, est erecta." And again, *i.*, 28: "Anno Domini millesimo ducentesimo tricesimo septimo, quinto idus Novembris, obiit Helias de Herfordia monachus, qui turrin abbatiæ Gloucestriæ erexit, stalla monachorum antiqua construxit, conductum aquæ vivæ fecit."

² *Hist. et Cart. i.*, 27: "Capella Beatæ Mariæ in cineterio, ex sumtibus Radulphi de Wylintone senioris, est consummata, quique redditum dedit quo sustentarentur imperpetuum duo presbyteri ibidem pro defunctis celebraturi." And in *i.* 59, we read how Ralph gave "unam hidam terræ in Ablintone ad sustentationem capellæ Beatæ Mariæ in abbathya quam a fundamentis construxerat." Olympias appears in the same page and in many others;

³ *Hist. et Cart. i.*, 29: "Et Anno Domini millesimo ducentesimo quadragesimo secundo completa est nova volta in navi ecclesiæ, non auxilio fabrorum ut primo, sed animosa virtute monachorum item in ipso loco existentium."

south-western tower was begun; at some time before 1246 it was finished.¹ This last entry must be taken in connexion with another under the year 1300. Then, in one of the endless fires, several parts of the conventual buildings perished, the great chamber, the cloister, and the little bell-tower—"parvum campanile."² This is the latest entry affecting the fabric of the church till we come to those changes of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries which gave it altogether a new character. Meanwhile much was done in the other buildings of the monastery. A new refectory was begun in 1246, and a new dormitory was begun in 1303, and finished in 1313.³

We must now look a little more minutely into the force of some of these entries. There can be little doubt that by the "Lady chapel in the churchyard" is meant a new Lady chapel at the east end of the church, the expression is an odd one. It might rather suggest such a chapel as stood against the east walk of the cloister at Wells. But I know of no reason to think that such a building ever existed at Gloucester; and, on the other hand, if Ralph Willington's chapel displaced the original finish of Serlo's east end, it has in turn given way to the existing chapel of the fifteenth century. The entries as to the towers are of more importance. The great eastern tower built in 1222 of course

¹ *Hist. et Cart.*, i. 29: "Et eodem anno incepta est nova turris versus occidentem in parte australi ejusdem ecclesiæ a Waltero de Sancto Johanne tunc priore ejusdem loci." The entry of its completion—"Istius (Johannis de Felda) tempore turris occidentalis a parte Australi perfecta est"—comes in the next page before the entry of 1246.

² The fire began on the Epiphany, 1300: "In abbathia Gloucestræ in una domo super meremium in magna curia abbatiæ. De cujus igne accensa fuerunt multa per abbatiæ loca, videlicet parvum campanile et magna camera et claustrum." *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 35.

³ *Hist. et Cart.*, i. 30, 41: "Anno Domini, mccxlvii., dirutum est vetus refectorium monachorum et incepta est structura novi." "Anno Domini, mccciii., dirutum est vetus dormitorium monachorum hujus loci circa festum Sancti Michaelis, et incepta est structura novi dormitorii." "Anno Domini, mcccxiii., novum dormitorium hujus domus circa festum Sancti Michaelis perficitur, et fratres monachi ex cellis egredientes cum lectis suis omnes se ad novum dormitorium transferunt." The sprinkling with holy water was done by David Martin, Bishop of St. David's.

means the central tower over the choir. We are left to guess whether the original Norman tower had not been carried up, whether it had given way and needed rebuilding, or whether, like a good many other towers, it was raised a stage or two more than the original builders had ever thought of. Whatever it was that Helias the sacrist did, it involved some change in the choir below the tower which made a new dedication needful. In no other way can we account for Gloucester coming among the churches to which the order of 1239 extended. Singularly enough, while all trace of the constructive work of Helias has given way before the changes of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, one little trace of his ritual arrangements is still left in the shape of a small piece of woodwork among the canopies on the prior's side of the choir which is clearly part of the stallwork of the thirteenth century. With regard to the western towers, we have to put together the story in Giraldus about the fall of a western tower between 1164 and 1179, the building of the south-western tower between 1242 and 1246, and the burning of the "little campanile" in 1300. It is of course possible that the story in Giraldus refers to the south-west tower, and that the damage done about 1170 was not repaired till 1242. This at first sight seems hardly likely; and, if it is said that the repairs or rebuilding would have been noticed in the local history, the same may be said as to the fall in Bishop Roger's day which made repair or rebuilding needful. Yet here is an argument which looks that way. What is the "parvum campanile" of the entry of 1300? Is it one of the western towers, or is it a detached bell-tower? Either of these would doubtless be small as compared with the great mid-tower of Helias. And the fact that in other entries, both this and the western towers are spoken of, not as "campanile" but as "turris" cuts both ways. And, if it be said that a detached bell-tower could not be needed in a church which had a central and two western towers, there is the example of Chichester—to say nothing of Bordeaux—to prove the contrary. Still it would seem more natural to understand the words of one of the western towers of the church. Now, with the arrangements of

Gloucester abbey, where the conventual buildings lie north of the church, a fire that destroyed the cloister and the great chamber—the great chamber of the Abbot, I suppose—would be not unlikely to reach the north-western tower that stood near them. If that tower was still the original Norman tower, while the south-west tower had been rebuilt—and doubtless raised—about 1245, it would be rightly described as “*parvum campanile*.” We may conceive then that, in the middle of the thirteenth century, the west front of Gloucester abbey, like those of Chartres, of Amiens, of Canterbury till the rebuilding of the north-west tower in the present century, had two unequal towers, of an inequality so marked that the northern and more ancient was known as the “little tower.” This view fits in well with everything except the unlikelihood that in so busy a building age the monks of Gloucester should have left their south-western tower a wreck for about fifty years. If Giraldus had told us, not only that the tower that fell stood at the west-end, but at what corner of the west-end, we could argue with greater certainty.

To set down all the fires which did more or less damage to Gloucester city and monastery would be simply endless. The minster itself seems to have shared the nature of the salamander. At this particular fire of 1300, which burned the cloister and the little tower, we are told that, owing to the prayers of the crowds of people that came together, the damage went no further; the main body of the minster *was* saved.¹ The next year a neighbouring minster was less lucky. The church of the new Llanthony near Gloucester was utterly burned with its four towers—“*cum quatuor campanilibus*.”² What was its form? Three towers to the body and one detached? Or did it follow some of the arrangements unusual in England, as at

¹ “*Concurrentibus undique populis et orantibus multis, totum incendium ita celeriter impeditum est, ut magis miraculo quam auxilio magno ascriberetur.*” Giraldus Cambrensis, vol. vij., 64; Rous series.

² “*Ecclesia Lantonie juxta Gloucestriam combusta fuit totaliter usque ad muros cum quatuor campanilibus, nec aliqua remansit campana quin fundebatur aut frangebatur.*” *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 35.

Bordeaux with the four towers to the transepts, or at Andernach with the two pairs of towers, eastern and western?

We have now reached a time in which we begin to get clearer personal notions of the abbots. Under Abbot Reginald, who sat from 1263 to 1284, we hear nothing of building, but his reign was a memorable one in the history of the abbey. The house of Saint Peter was now to send forth a new colony of a kind other than its dependent priories on the Welsh border. It marks the development of the English Universities, it marks the beginnings of the collegiate system within them, that in 1283 "our house at Oxford" was founded by John Gifford.¹ In him the monks of Gloucester found an enlightened benefactor. It did not become them to lag behind in making the most of the advantages which were offered by the growth of learning and the opportunities for learning. They had now their own hall, Gloucester Hall, on the site of the present Worcester College, as a dwelling for such of their body as were designed to keep up the tradition of Benedictine culture in a new shape. Fourteen years later the new plantation bore fruit. The chronicle records with natural glee how William Brook, a monk of Gloucester, received the degree of doctor of divinity, another monk of the house disputing with him. Abbot Gamages of Gloucester was present with a great train, so were a goodly company of other abbots and monks, while both those present and most of the prelates of the province of Canterbury loaded the inceptor with gifts.² Three years later Dr. Brook, then prior, had the pleasure of admitting his former opponent Laurence Hanson to the

¹ The foundation of Gloucester Hall, "domus nostra apud Oxoniam," is reported in the History and Chartulary, i. 32. "A nobili viro domno Johanne Gyfforde, conventu monachorum Gloucestriae, in die Sancti Johannis Evangelistae a venerabili patre domno Reginaldo tunc abbate Gloucestrensi tunc ibidem solenniter introducto domno Johanne Gyfforde praesente ad idem et volente." Are we to suppose that the whole convent of Gloucester went bodily to Oxford?

² The inception of Dr. Brook—Willelmus de Brok—is recorded with great glee and at some length. The Abbot, John Gamages, came "cum monachis suis, prioribus, obedientariis, claustralibus, clericis, esquieriis, et aliis nobilibus viris ad centum equos." *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 34.

same degree.¹ Abbot Gamages, the prelate of lordly presence and worshipful baldness, whom the great Edward deemed the most venerable man in his whole realm,² was the giver of many gifts to his church, besides the beginning of the dormitory in his days. But the second great time of building in the minster itself begins with his successor John Thoky in 1306.

The first work was the reconstruction of the south aisle of the nave about 1318.³ It is as every one knows, one of the richest examples of the style of the fourteenth century. Professor Willis pointed out the near kindred between the tracery of its windows, with their unusual diverging spokes, and those of Merton chapel at Oxford. From a local point of view it is more curious to compare this lavishly adorned aisle with some other examples on this side of England, the stately windows of the great aisle at Leominster being pre-eminent above all. We may mark also the small flying buttresses supporting the newly built wall raised on the original Norman basement. The recasting of this aisle was the only architectural work of the abbacy of John Thoky, but an event of his day led to great architectural works indeed in the days of his successors. We have seen the church of Gloucester become the burying-place of a prince whom England twice rejected without trial; it has now to become the burying-place and something more of a prince whom England no less emphatically rejected after trial. Of all strange forms of devotion surely one of the strangest is that which saw a saint and martyr in Edward the Second after the Conquest. Yet to that abnormal worship the abbey of Gloucester owes its present form. I am half inclined to put it the other way, and to make it a new count in the articles of deposi-

¹ "Laurentius de Honsom monachus Gloucestræ incœpit in sacra theologia apud Oxoniam sub domno Willelmo de Brok, priore Sancti Petri Gloucestræ, doctore ejusdem facultatis." *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 35.

² "Fertur regem Edwardum de ipso dixisse apud Ambresbirie ad sepulturam matris suae, ubi erant omnes praelati Angliæ." "Non apparet mihi tam venerabilis persona in regno meo sicut abbas Gloucestræ." *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 41.

³ "Eodem tempore (mcccxviii tempore Johannis Thoky) constructa est ala australis in navi ecclesiæ tempore istius abbatis expensis multis et sumptuosis." *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 44.

tion against the unworthy king that this misguided devotion has cost us the minster of Serlo in its perfect form, and hinders us from studying the contrast which we should otherwise have been able to mark between its eastern and its western limb.¹ Yet we may resign ourselves to the loss which has given us so curious a lesson in the art of reconstruction, a work carried on after one general pattern during more than a hundred years.

The connexion of Abbot Thoky with Edward of Caernarvon began early. In the days of his father the Prince visited the abbey. He dined in the Abbot's hall, which was adorned with pictures of the kings of the English. Was it treasonable imagining of his father's death when he asked in merriment whether they would ever have his likeness among his forefathers? The Abbot, under a prophetic impulse, we are told, answered that he trusted one day to have him in a worthier place than that.² And when therefore he had run his course of evil, when he had lost his crown by a lawful sentence and his life by unlawful violence, when the abbots of other monasteries, of Bristol and Kingswood and Malmesbury, feared to receive his body, Abbot John of Gloucester went to the castle of Berkeley with a car adorned with the arms of the church of Gloucester; he bore away the body of the deposed king, and, with a solemn procession of monks and citizens, buried it on the north side of the high altar of the minster.³ Soon after this Abbot Thoky resigned his office into the hands of John Wigmore, in whose abbacy of eight years, from 1329 to 1337, great changes began.

The chronicle now records with delight the many oblations of the faithful at the tomb of the prince from whom the estates

¹ Perhaps it is right to say that, when I spoke thus freely of the conventional founder of Oriel College, I had not become one of his fellows.

² The King is dining in the Abbot's hall, "et ibidem videns depictas figuras regum prædecessorum suorum, jocosè sciscitabatur ab abbate utrum haberet eum depictum iter ipsos an non. Cui respondit, magis prophetando quam fabulando, quod speraret se ipsum habiturum in honestiori loco quam ibi, quod ita evenit." *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 44.

³ "In ecclesia ibidem in parte boreali juxta magnum altare." *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 45.

of England had taken away the crown that they had given.¹ The fall is great from Waltheof and Simon to Thomas of Lancaster; here we have a lower fall from Thomas to him who slew him. The chronicle however does not venture to attribute miracles to Edward the Second, nor do we read of any such ritual being held in his honour as that which so daringly changed

into "Gloriosi corporis mysterium"

"Gloriosi comitis martyrium."

Abbot Wigmore was a great builder; he built much in his own abbatial house and built also the grange and other buildings at Highnam²; and now, out of the offerings at the tomb of Edward he began a work which altogether changed the character of his church. The eastern part of Serlo's minster still stood untouched, save by the carrying up of the mid-tower by Helias. Abbot Wigmore began a transformation which recast part of the church in a new architectural style of which he or his architect may fairly be called the inventor. I well remember how, three and twenty years ago, I listened to Professor Willis as he set forth the design of this Abbot and thereby upset my whole notions of later architectural chronology. I had believed—I fancy everybody had believed—that the first beginnings of the Perpendicular style were to be found in the works of Bishop Edington at Winchester; but here, as the Professor showed us from undoubted evidence, from the written record combined with what our eyes saw in the building itself, was work, not quite fully developed Perpendicular, but so far advanced that it must be called Perpendicular rather than any

¹ "Tempore cujus (Johannis Wygmor) incoepit oblatio fidelium et devotio quam habuit erga regem Edwardum in ecclesia tumulatum, ita ut infra paucos annos tanta erat plebis frequentatio ut civitas Gloucestricæ vix caperet multitudinem populorum ex diversis civitatibus Angliæ, villis, ac vicis, illuc confluentium, ita quod de oblationibus ibidem oblatis infra vi. annos prælationis suæ alam Sancti Andree, ut nunc cernitur, a fundamentis usque ad finem perduxit." *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 46.

² Magnam grangiam apud Hynham a fundamentis construxit, et cameram abbatis juxta magnam aulam, cum parva aula sibi annexa et capella ibidem perfecit. *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 46.

other style, built between 1321 and 1335. All the essential features of the style are there, that specially English variety of the great Gothic family, which, whether for good or evil, effectually distinguishes the architecture of our land from that of every other. The south aisle of the nave is one of the most perfect examples of one style; the south transept, so very few years later, is a nearly perfect example of another. The change of taste must have been sudden indeed. Whether we like the change which he wrought or not, yet, as marking an epoch in the history of architecture in England, John Wigmore ranks with the Confessor at Westminster, with William of Saint-Calais at Durham, with Roger of Caen at Sherborne and Malmesbury, with Hugh of Avalon in the choir of Lincoln. The fact is hard to believe: but the tale is plain and undeniable. Abbot Wigmore, within six years from his promotion, completed from its foundations the aisle of Saint Andrew, that is, the south transept, as we now see it.

The transformation of the Norman minster had thus begun. And the strange source of income which had enabled the brotherhood to begin it did not fail. The offerings of the tomb of Edward of Caernarvon still went on. They were so plentiful that some said that, if all had been spent on the fabric of the church, the whole church might have been renewed.¹ Happily this complete renewal was warded off, and in the parts which did put on a new dress at this time, renewal did not always go beyond throwing a kind of veil over the elder work. In the days of John of Wigmore's successor, Adam of Staunton, Abbot from 1337 to 1351, the great vault of the choir was made at a great and costly expense, together with the stalls on the prior's side.² Under Thomas Horton, Abbot from 1351 to 1377, the work was

¹ "Ut opinio vulgi dicit, quod, si omnes oblationes ibidem collatæ super ecclesiam expedirentur, potuisset, facillime de novo reparari." *Hist. et Cart.* i., 47.

² "Domnus Adam de Stauntone successit venerabili magistro suo Johanni Wygmore cuius tempore constructa est magna volta chori magnis et multis expensis et sumptuosis, cum stallis ibidem ex parte prioris ex oblatione fidelium ad tumbam regis confluentium." The oblations are described at some length. *Hist. et Cart.* i., 47.

brought to an end. The high altar, with the presbytery, and the stalls on the abbot's side, were begun and finished, seemingly in the early part of this abbot's reign.¹ He also made the images and tabernacle work at the entrance of the choir on the north side.² And in 1368 he began, and in 1374 he finished, the tracing of Saint Paul's aisle, that is to say the north transept.³ The cost of his works was 781 pounds and twopence, of which the Abbot himself paid 444 pounds and the odd twopence.⁴ He also began the cloister which was finished by his successor Walter of Frocester, Abbot from 1381 to 1412.⁵ To him we owe the compiling of the chronicle which we have hitherto been following. It is continued into his own abbacy, but it ends before his death.

We thus part company with our best authority for the history of the church. And we shall have again to turn to Abbot Frocester's narrative, which gets more life-like as he gets nearer to his own time, for some further pictures of Gloucester and its abbey in the fourteenth century. But the transformation of the church is not yet done with, even so far as that transformation was actually carried out. We have now mainly to trust to tradition, as handed down by Leland; but there is no reason to doubt the accuracy of the dates which we get from this source for those parts of the fabric of which we

¹ The benefactions of this abbot are described at great length in the History. The entry which concerns us follows in the next page. "Opere et industria ejusdem, magnum altare cum presbiterio ibidem cum stallis ex parte abbatis fuerunt incepta et consummata." *Hist. et Cart.*, i. 49.

² "Item construxit in ingressum chori in parte boreali imagines cum tabernaculis ibidem." *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 50.

³ Ala Sancti Pauli quæ incepta fuit in monasterio Beati Petri in crastino Epiphaniæ Domini anno regni regis Edwardi tertii post conquestum quadragesimo primo, et in vigilia natalis Domini anno regni regis supradicti quadragesimo septimo, cum gratia Dei plenarie est consummata." *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ "Clastrum monasterii quod fuit inceptum tempore Thomæ Hortone abbatis et ad ostium capituli perductum, et multis annis imperfectum ibidem relictum, magnis expensis et sumptuosis honorifice construxit." *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 55.

have not yet spoken. The next abbot to which any architectural work is attributed, John Morwent, who sat from 1420 to 1437, turned his thoughts westward, and undertook to bring the nave into harmony with the new forms which had been given to the choir and transepts. He began at the west end, where it is plain that he altogether pulled down the towers, as Bishop Edington had done at Winchester, and as was also done at Saint Albans. The only question is whether he found two towers to destroy, that is whether the damage of 1300 had been made good. In any case he pulled down the south-west tower of 1242. The place of the destroyed towers was taken by a west front consisting merely of the ends of the nave and aisles; inside they gave way to those two bays of later work which form the beginning of a design, which happily was never carried out, for the reconstruction of the whole nave. The great south porch is also Abbot Morwent's work, and, I presume, also the clerestory windows of the nave. At his hands the western limb of the church put on its present shape, as the eastern, northern, and southern limbs had done at the hands of his predecessors.

Two works more were needed to complete the recasting which had been going on ever since a source of profit was first found in the tomb of Edward of Caernarvon. Thomas Seabrook, Abbot from 1450 to 1457, began—it does not appear who finished—the central tower, the actual architect being one of the monks named Robert Tully.¹ For this fact we need not go to tradition only; the names, both of Seabrook and Tully—who was afterwards Bishop of Saint David's—are graven on their work. The next abbacy, that of Richard Henley, lasted from 1457 to 1472, and in his day the Lady chapel was at least begun. Thus, in the space of about one hundred and forty years, by far the greater part of the original minster of Serlo had been on the recast, bit by bit, in an altogether different style, and with altogether a new outline. Outside at least, its original builders would not have known their own

¹ The verses are given in the *Monasticon*, i. 586 :

“ Hoc quod digestum specularis opusque politum,
Tullii hæc ex onere Seabroke abbate jubente.”

work. Save some windows and other remains in the transepts, the eastern chapels, and elsewhere in the eastern part of the church, all traces of Serlo's church had vanished. To the eye of a traveller approaching for the first time, Gloucester abbey, after the changes of the fifteenth century, must have had the air of a church of which hardly any part had stood for a much longer time than a century. In the inside it was only in the nave that any part remained untouched. The whole work, though spread over so long a space of time, was done from one general design, so far at least as that one general object was aimed at throughout. The church was to be recast rather than rebuilt; it was to be transformed into altogether another guise, but—with the exception of Abbot Morwent's destruction of the western towers—with as little sacrifice as might be of the original work. There is at Gloucester no complete rebuilding or addition at all answering to the successive enlargements which gave a new character to the churches of Lincoln and Ely. The only part which has at all the character of an altogether new building is no part of the four essential limbs, but the eastern Lady chapel. In the choir and presbytery above all, the work hardly amounts to recasting; it is simply overlaying. In the mere use of materials the transformers practised a remarkable economy. They did not waste a single stone of the elder building that could be left in its place or used again in a new place. A considerable part of the front of the south transept consists in this way of stones first cut in the eleventh or twelfth century, keeping the details of the eleventh or twelfth century, but used up again in the fourteenth. The arch of the great south window is made of voussoirs thus pressed to do service a second time. Inside the building, the Norman shafts have been put to strange uses. The coupled shafts under the lantern have lost their capitals and have been joined together to form the limbs of the letter Y. Others have been made to forsake their upright direction and to bend themselves towards any point where they could be made to bear up parts of the vault. This practice of wasting nothing that could be used again was usual with the mediæval builders. It is far more common than many think to find stones showing the details of an earlier age than

that at which, whenever they were actually carved, they were put into their present places. But at Gloucester the fashion is carried to an unusual extent. The appearance of the south transept might well puzzle a learner; it needs some familiarity with the ways of the old masons to look quite calmly on a great Perpendicular window set in an arch enriched with the Norman chevron.

We may here profitably compare the work of transformation which went on at Gloucester with the treatment of several other of our great churches which underwent more or less of change during the later days of mediæval architecture. I speak of cases which did not amount to rebuilding from the ground. This latter process we can see in the eastern limbs of Ely and Lincoln, where the earlier buildings have left no sign at all, except that single pair of Norman responds at Ely which mark the beginning of the ancient apse. In the nave of Canterbury the work of Lanfranc seems at first sight to have utterly perished; yet its extent determined the extent of the present building, and there is actually more of his masonry left in the walls than any one would think for. In the nave of Winchester the great mass of the Norman masonry is there still; it is not merely overlaid, neither is it altogether rebuilt; it is disguised so as to show a wholly different face to the beholder; but its substance has not perished. But the building which may be best contrasted with the eastern limb of Gloucester is the eastern limb of Norwich. In both minsters the men of the fourteenth century wished to recast a Romanesque building in the style of their own age. In both cases the work to be done was recasting and not absolute rebuilding. In both cases the builders had to deal with a short eastern limb of the last days of the eleventh century, and in both cases they wished to give their new work a measure of height which was unusual in English buildings, and which quite disregarded the proportions of the other parts of the two churches themselves. The presbytery of Norwich soars over the nave; the presbytery of Gloucester soars, not only over its own nave, but I believe over every existing church in England, save only Westminster and York. In other points those who undertook to recast the two

churches set about the work in altogether different ways. At Gloucester, as we enter the choir, the general effect is that of a Perpendicular building. We feel that there is something singular about it, that its effect differs altogether from that of an ordinary Perpendicular building or of any building with regular and prominent pillars and arches. The feeling is more like that of a single-bodied building, a gigantic college-chapel or a church like Alby without aisles. It is not till we look a little more narrowly that we find that the greater part of the Norman building is still actually there, not rebuilt, not even disguised as at Winchester, but simply hidden behind a veil of Perpendicular lace-work. It is only the apse that has perished utterly; Adam Stanton or his architect was indeed possessed even beyond other men with the English taste for a single gigantic east window. He would have a window beyond all windows, a window so great that it should be wider than the presbytery of which it was the finish, and could be brought in only by making something exactly opposite to an apse, something with slanting sides indeed, but sides that slant outwards instead of inwards. At Norwich, on the other hand, far more of the original work was left untouched, but so much as was touched at all was changed much more thoroughly. Alike at Gloucester and at Norwich the clerestory was rebuilt. The difference is in the treatment of the two lower stages. At Norwich there is no overlaying; at Gloucester the Norman triforium is still in being, and we may still walk in it. But it is veiled. The Norwich triforium is in no way veiled; it looks out as freely as it did in the days of Herbert Losinga. But, while, as at Gloucester, the triforium carries a clerestory and vault of which its first builders never dreamed, the side pier-arches have been more than veiled, they have been altogether recast in a fashion of which the first builders could have dreamed still less. But its two lower stages remain as they were built. By the greatest contrast of all, the apse at Norwich is untouched, except—an important exception certainly—that the rebuilding of the clerestory has made its upper portion polygonal, but its two lower stages remain as they were built. At Gloucester, in short, the later work, without destroying the elder, altogether obscures it, and decides the general effect of the

building. At Norwich the later work has largely supplanted the elder, but, where the elder work abides at all, it is in no way obscured. The general effect is not that of either style, but of a singular combination of the two side by side, or rather one over the other, which is immeasurably more satisfactory than could have been looked for. Both Gloucester and Norwich are Norman eastern limbs modified, but not completely rebuilt, in the later style. They keep therefore somewhat of the proportion of the older design. At Norwich indeed the ground plan of choir and presbytery is quite untouched, and both cleave to the elder tradition which placed the actual choir under the mid-tower, in contrast to the free eastern limbs of Lincoln and Wells from which all memory of that arrangement has vanished.

The comparison between Gloucester and Norwich leads us to one very curious question with regard to the recasting of Gloucester, namely, what became of the great central tower built by Helias the sacrist in the thirteenth century? It is impossible to look at the choir as it now stands without asking with a good deal of eagerness how it was affected by the works which were carried on underneath it. If it stood, or was designed to stand, surely no more daring work was ever undertaken than the putting up of the "magna volta" by Abbot Thoky. As we have seen, Serlo's own tower might seem to have rested on less firm support than such works commonly did. We have seen the strange way in which his shafts were treated, turned into something more like gas-pipes than anything else. The arches which sprang from them, the arches of the lantern, were cut away to make room for new arches, if they can be so called, which are hardly more than vaulting ribs, while, by a freak which, I believe, is constructively far less dangerous than it seems, a light rib spans the space where arches should be, and from it rises the "magna volta" itself. Now it is worth noticing that all this is only carrying the original peculiarity of the Gloucester and Tewkesbury lanterns somewhat further. They must have had, even in the eleventh century, much less than usual of the character of lanterns, of central spaces marked off from the four limbs on each side of it. We must not forget that at Tewkesbury certainly, and

therefore most likely at Gloucester also, the arcades in the tower above the lantern arch were once open to the choir below. But at Tewkesbury, it may have been that the little prominence of the lantern arches which now suggested the insertion of the vault goes far to make the crossing only one bay in the general length of the church. At Gloucester they went still further; they destroyed the feeling of a lantern, of a crossing, altogether. Standing in Gloucester choir, it is hard indeed to believe that we are standing underneath a central tower. Now what became of the tower of Helias? It is certain that there is now nothing left of it. The Norman work goes up to a certain height, then the Perpendicular work comes at once upon it; there is no intermediate stage, not even a range of stones, of the thirteenth century. Was the tower pulled down with a view to the rebuilding which was carried out in the next century? We should not have been surprised to hear that the reckless dealing with its supports had brought it down altogether. But, had this happened, there would surely have been some record of it. And, if the tower of Helias was for any cause taken down at this time, it opens a curious question as to Abbot Morwent's work of destruction at the west end. There, as we have seen, he pulled down the western towers twenty years before the building of the present central tower. And we are thus led to the somewhat strange conclusion that there was a time, and not a very short time, during which the minster of Gloucester stood, and that by the act of its own abbots, without any towers at all? Again, the only motive that one can conceive for the pulling down of the western towers would be to give greater prominence and dignity to the central tower. Such a motive seems altogether a mistake; but it is hard to conceive any other motive. Only, if no central tower was standing in Abbot Morwent's time, he must have pulled down the western towers in faith, to secure greater dignity for a central tower which he hoped some day would be there. It is certain that the present mid-tower was not built till the western towers were pulled down. There are however some signs which might suggest that though the present central tower was not actually built till twenty years later, its building was designed from the very first beginning

of the recasting in the south transept. Every one must have noticed the great preparations made in the way of buttresses inside and out, to keep up a tower which at least seems to have so little direct support in the shape of its own piers. Of these props some of those in the south transept seem clearly to have been thrust in at the building of the present tower in the fifteenth century. But other parts seem to be part and parcel of the work of overlaying in the fourteenth. One is driven to think that all that was done in those centuries was done from one elaborate design, of which the rebuilding of the mid-tower formed a part, and was therefore provided for from the very beginning. The only difficulty ere this was that one is driven to ask why the builders of this time deliberately designed to destroy a tower which, one would have thought, they might have simply overlaid like the rest of the building.

The architectural changes at Gloucester in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries have an interest far wider than that of any merely local history. They form an epoch in the history of architecture, and the explanation of them given by Professor Willis in 1860 formed an epoch in the study of that history. But, startling as his teaching was, it was not wholly our own fault that we had none of us found out how early Perpendicular architecture came, at Gloucester at least, into use. The local History, from which Professor Willis first got his dates, was not printed till 1863. There is a kind of summary of it in the *Monasticon*, but it is done in a piece-meal, unintelligent fashion, out of which nothing short of the acuteness of Professor Willis himself could have seen the way to any light. Now the whole matter is clear; there is the building; here are its authentic dates, and we now know that the Perpendicular style was in use as early as 1330. But it certainly did not come into common use till a good deal later, and we may pretty confidently set down the work at Gloucester as the earliest instance of its use. In short, so far as we can speak of an architectural style being invented, we may safely say that the later variety of Gothic which is distinctive of England was invented in Gloucester abbey. And am I refining too much if I suggest that the particular use to which it was put in Gloucester Abbey

had its effect on the forms of the style? The Gloucester Perpendicular, both of the fourteenth and the fifteenth century, has a character of its own, which is shared by some other buildings in the same part of England which may well have followed its model—such as the towers of Worcester cathedral and Malvern priory and by some buildings in the city of Gloucester itself—but which has little in common with either of the two great varieties of Perpendicular, that of Somerset and that of East-Anglia. The style of Somerset spreads into Gloucestershire; but the style of Gloucester itself is quite different. Now it has struck me for years that the ornamental work at Gloucester has a character of its own, which comes out in a marked way if we compare the towers of the abbey with any of the great Perpendicular towers elsewhere. The panel-work, if we can so call it, looks as if it were nailed on to the main body of the building. It does not seem part of the substance of the wall; it looks like something that might conceivably be taken off and put on again. Is it possible that in this appearance, which I noticed long before I knew the true dates of the building, we have the key to the whole story, and in truth the key to the origin of the Perpendicular style. A great deal of the Perpendicular ornament at Gloucester was, we may say, nailed on. It was something stuck against or thrown over walls, pillars, arches, which were already in being. This origin gave the local style a character which clave even to those parts of the building where the same process had not taken place. But, more than this, notwithstanding the many merits of the Perpendicular style, we cannot help asking the question how men came to prefer a series of straight lines in panelling and tracery to the certainly more elegant carved lines. It is easy to say that the straight line is needful to carry out the general tendencies of the style; so it is; a Perpendicular window is in its place in a Perpendicular building, while a window of Geometrical or Flowing tracery would not be in its place. Yet we have the fact that a more elegant form was forsaken for a less elegant one. In such a case we should have looked for a hard-fought struggle between the new forms and the old, in other words for a long period of transition. And a period of transition there is, a time

in which the Flowing and the Perpendicular line were struggling for the mastery. We see signs of such a struggle in this very Saint Andrew's aisle at Gloucester in which we find the birthplace of the Perpendicular style. But, compared with other periods of transition, the struggle is neither long nor sharp; we may say on the whole that the Perpendicular style, wherever and whenever it did come in, came in with a rush. The two forms, Flowing and Perpendicular, must have been for a good while used side by side; but they seem to have influenced one another much less than styles which were used side by side commonly did. The Gloucester builders, when they had once started their new style, went on using it; but the rest of England did not generally adopt it till later. It may very well be that, though the Winchester architects did not invent it, they first made it a general fashion. Now why was all this? Why were the lines made straight at all, and why were they made straight at Gloucester before they were made straight in other places? May it not be because, for the particular purpose for which the style was first used at Gloucester, for the purpose of nailing or spreading something over something else, the straight line was most convenient? In the veil thrown over the Norman work of the presbytery, many long straight lines were unavoidable. They gave a character to the style which was carried out in the minuter details. But in other buildings, where the same process had not to be gone through, the fashion did not come into vogue till later. Nay more, the fact that Saint Andrew's aisle at Gloucester, which is, on this view, the very birthplace of the style, does not show the style in its full development, is itself part of the argument. The parts of the south transept which are still Transitional, where the Perpendicular line has not everything its own way, are the windows. From them the Flowing line is by no means wholly banished. Surely this is because the tracery of the windows was designed independently; it formed no part of the overlaying veil of vertical lines out of which I conceive the style to have grown. To carry the right line into the window tracery was a later stage. We may here compare our English work, especially in its Gloucester variety, with contemporary

French work. The Flamboyant style answers in date to our Perpendicular, and has, at least as seen in Normandy, the same general feelings and tendencies. It has even some special affinities with our Gloucester style. When the fashion was once set at Gloucester, there grew a genuine love for carrying right lines over something, often over one another. Though this differs in effect from Flamboyant interpenetration, the principle is the same. But the French style never took the final step, the straight line in panelling and window tracery.

It is to be noticed that Abbot Frocester's notice of the works in the eastern limb puts the great vault, "*magna volta*," first, as the ruling feature and object of the new work. So it doubtless was. Up to that time the presbytery had most likely kept a flat ceiling; England seems never, save in the Conqueror's chapel in the White Tower, to have adopted the South-Gaulish fashion of the barrel-vault and half-dome. Now, for the first time, the eastern part of the minster received a roof of stone, and a roof of a far more elaborate kind than that which the monks of the thirteenth century had thrown over the nave. Whatever else was done was done in subordination to this great novelty; the choir was vaulted, and other features of the eastern limb were brought into agreement with the new roof of the choir. Professor Willis has enlarged scientifically on the construction of the vaults of this period. To my untechnical eye they are less pleasing than either the simpler vaults of an earlier time or the yet more elaborate ones that come somewhat later. If we are to have a rich and elaborate vault, let us have fan tracery at once. And at Gloucester we need not go far for it, though we do not find it in the church itself, except on a very small scale at the entrance to the Lady chapel. The admirable cloister of the abbey, the work of Morton and Frocester, shows us that beautiful form of roofing in its most perfect form. It is, I imagine, the earliest example. Here, in a work more strictly original, a work of actual building and not of overlaying, the peculiarities which are due to the process of overlaying are less strongly marked, if they are marked at all. To bring them in, as in the little cloister, was a later stage. In any case the Gloucester cloister stands by itself, the most perfect

work of the kind in that form of mediæval art which is distinctly English and distinctly local. Through the whole of the recasting at Gloucester we are struck by the intensely English character of everything, whether in arrangement or in style strictly so-called. Everything which, for good or for evil, distinguishes the architecture of England from the architecture of other lands comes out at Gloucester in all its fulness. The predominant mid-tower, so predominant as to have called for the sacrifice of its western satellites—the west front, or rather the west end, formed by the simple undisguised endings of the nave and aisles—the low roofs throughout the building—the apse sacrificed to a single east window so huge as itself to become a kind of reversed apse—the Lady chapel forming a separate body projecting from the main building at a lower height—all these are features, some of which are absolutely and exclusively English, while all are characteristically English, far more usual in England than in other lands. Some of these features may not approve themselves to all tastes; I do not say that every one of them approves itself to mine; but all are intensely English. For good or for evil, Gloucester abbey is, in style, in plan, in outline, one of the most English of English churches. I am rather fond of supposing a man, skilled in history and architecture, but knowing nothing of the particular place, dropped from the sky or led blindfold from a far country to the cloister or other near neighbourhood of an English minster, and there finding out by the light of nature where he was and what was the history of the building on which he looked. I generally imagine his saying in the first breath, "I am either in England or in Normandy," and in the second, "I am in England and not in Normandy." At Gloucester I should hardly give Normandy, still less any other land, the chance even of the first breath. All, in style and in plan, is English, English of that special variety which Gloucester may claim as the growth of her own soil. If there ever were unmixed John Bulls in the world—the Maid of Domremy would have given them an uglier name—such surely were the abbots and architects of Gloucester in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the days of the Hundred Years' War.

I have thus finished the history of the fabric of the abbey church, so far as the available materials enable me to trace it. And you will see that, so far as I have traced it, I have traced it largely in the steps of Professor Willis. But I have kept myself mainly to the history of the church itself, dwelling but little on the other buildings of the monastery. For in every foundation, religious or secular, it is the church which is the great contribution made by the particular place to the general history and art of the country. Architectural style has a freer developement in a great church than it can have even in a refectory or a chapter-house; in the church the architect has freer scope for his personal tastes than he has in the buildings which surround the other three sides of a Benedictine cloister. Refectories cannot be very different from one another; even in chapter-houses there were but two main types to choose from. But in the church the builders had an almost boundless choice among endless varieties of plans, specially at the east end and at the west. The church then is generally the main object for the general inquirer; the other buildings of the monastery may often be left to the minuter care of the local antiquary. Yet we cannot forget that here at Gloucester we have monastic buildings of admirable merit far more extensively preserved, than it is usual to find them. At Gloucester we can see what a great Benedictine house was, far better than we can at Ely, at Norwich, or at Peterborough. The cloister has no rival in its own class. The glazing of its windows gives it an effect which is so striking, so completely unique, that we almost forget that it forbids any general view of the church and its accompanying buildings from any point of the cloister itself. Of those buildings on every side of the cloister the remains are neither few nor unimportant. The refectory of Abbot John de Felda,¹ once the seat of royal feasting, has left fewer remains than any other; but enough survives to give some notion of its design, and to show that, as became one of the chief buildings of Gloucester abbey, its great eastern window formed part of a vast panelled design. Beyond it lie the more distant buildings of the monastery, the

¹ *Hist. et Cart.*, i., p. 30.

stately lodgings of the abbot beyond the little stream now hidden, like the Fleet of London or the Frome of Bristol, the second cloister—was it the great prelate's own private walk?—and the graceful ruins of the infirmary. We see remains of earlier days, coffins built into the walls and bricks which remind us how near we are to the wall of Glevum. We come back to the cloister, to mark to the west the quarters of the prior and his successor the dean, showing us a stage of architecture of which we have no exact specimen in the minster itself. To the east we have the slype, the dormitory, now the library, above, and the building of greatest importance after the church itself. The chapter-house of Gloucester abbey well deserves careful study. Here, as in the church, we see a Romanesque building with its eastern part recast in Perpendicular, the lesser apse however not having so utterly vanished as the greater. The contrast between the two parts is startling; yet in this matter of chapter-houses, the earliest and the latest style have a certain fellowship with one another. At both dates the oblong shape seems to have been preferred to the polygonal shape—growing out of the Worcester round—which we find in the intermediate time. One thing is clear; the polygonal shape is a mark of date, and is no mark of difference between regulars and seculars. It is found indifferently, during the centuries when it is found at all, in foundations of both classes.

But the last pages of Abbot Frocester's history give us glimpses of the life of Gloucester abbey quite distinct from those which concern the many changes in the fabric. At the same meeting when Professor Willis traced out the history of the minster, another inquirer, also since lost to us, traced out another side of the history of the city, and a side yet more closely connected with the general history of the country. Gloucester, once a special seat of national assemblies, did not altogether lose that character till the fifteenth century, and Mr. Hartshorne, in his paper on "the Parliaments of Gloucester,"¹ carefully brought to light this aspect of Gloucester history. The old *Gemôts* of Gloucester come specially home to me; in dealing with the great

¹ *Archæological Journal*, xvii., p. 201.

Gemôt of 1051, I felt that Mr. Hartshorne was, even in 1860, straying on my ground; I took possession of Earl Godwine and all that belongs to him on his own South-Saxon soil in 1853. But I am content humbly to follow Mr. Hartshorne's lead as to the assemblies held at Gloucester from the twelfth century onwards. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries Gloucester had ceased to be a place of yearly gatherings as it had been in the eleventh, but not a few memorable councils were held here. It still was, as in the days of the Confessor, the special place for discussing the affairs of Wales, for receiving the homage of Welsh princes, for planning campaigns to withstand or to punish their incursions. The assembly of 1234 bears the name of *Colloquium*—the name so common in Germany—and Mr. Hartshorne discusses the force of the name, or rather its lack of any special force. With our elder Gloucester experience, we might say that *Colloquium* is simply good Latin, while *Parliamentum* is bad, and that both are nothing but translations of the "deep speech" that King William had with his Witan, here in Gloucester, in 1085. Gloucester however, though the seat of assemblies both under Henry the Third and under the great Edward, did not see a full-grown Parliament of Lords Spiritual and Temporal, of Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses, till a much later day. Edward of Caernarvon held no Parliament on the spot where he was received in life and was to be worshipped after death. Nor did Edward the Third, while winning glory for the arms of England and losing the ancient possessions of England, call the estates of the realm together to see how England was meanwhile developing a hitherto unknown form of art. It was not till the early days of Richard the Second, till the year 1378, when the power of John, Duke of Lancaster was paramount, that Gloucester saw another gathering of the Lords and Commons of England. The political importance of that Parliament was set forth by Mr. Hartshorne, as it has since been more fully set forth by Dr. Stubbs.¹ It holds no small place in the history of the stages by which the House of Commons won to itself the control of the national purse. But we are now more concerned with the local aspect of the assembly, and with Abbot Frocester's vivid

¹ *Constitutional History*, iv., 446.

description of the state of things within the walls of the abbey. Not small were the grievances of the Abbot and the whole convent, when the King was quartered within the monastery, and its chief buildings were turned to the use of the estates of the realm. The meeting of Parliament drew with it such a crowd of people of all kinds that the monastery seemed more like a market-place than a religious house.¹ The cloister-garth, once fresh with grass, was so trodden down by wrestlers and players at ball that not a blade of green was left in it.² The chapter-house, the refectory, the guest-hall, the chamber called from its beauty the King's chamber, were all occupied for the meetings of the two houses or for the more private discussions of the King's councillors.³ The monks had to seek shelter where they could in their own house; they had to dine in the dormitory or in the school, and to have their meals cooked in the orchard.⁴ It was perhaps a relief when, towards the end of the Parliament, things returned so far to their natural uses that the young king held a great feast in the refectory, it is not said at whose cost.⁵ But in the end

¹ All these curious details come from the personal witness of Abbot Frocester, who was then chamberlain of the abbey. "Omnia loca in monasterio patentia sic ad parliamentum venientibus frequentata fuere ut magis loca nundinarum quam religiosa cernentibus apparerent." *Hist. et Cart.*, i., 53.

² "Nam viridum claustrum tanta luctantium et ad pilam ludentium exercitatione extitit deplanatum quod nulla viriditatis vestigia in ibi sperabantur." *Ibid.*

³ "In refectorio de armorum legibus tractabatur, aula autem hospitum communi parlamento erat deputata. Porro in camera hospitii, quæ camera regis propter ejus pulchritudinem antiquitus vocata est, consilium secretum inter magnates versabatur, ac in domo capituli consilium commune." *Ibid.*

⁴ The King and his whole following were lodged in the abbey "Quæ eis et parlamento ita undique erat impleta ut conventus per aliquot dies in dormitorio, postea vero in domo scolæ utilius consultus tam diebus carniû quam piscium durante parlamento necessitate urgente integro manducaret, quibus diebus in pomerio eorum prandium parabatur." *Ibid.*

⁵ The feast and the mass that went before it are described at some length. i. 53, 54.

the minds of the monks of Gloucester were relieved as to the general results of the assembly. Rumour had gone abroad that frightfully heavy taxes were to be laid on the kingdom in general and on churchmen in particular. It was a comfort then when the merchants, who could afford such grants—"quia pecuniosi erant"—voted money on behalf of the whole nation for carrying on the king's wars.¹ It was no part of the business of a Gloucester writer to set down that the grant of the merchants proved far from enough, and that the next year a Parliament held at Westminster was driven to lay a poll-tax on everybody from Duke John downwards,² a poll-tax whose successor of the next year every child has heard of.

The last event recorded in the Abbot's chronicle was likely to give more pleasure in the abbey than the visit of King Richard and his Parliament. In Abbot Frocester's time many privileges were gained to the house of Saint Peter by the Pope, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the bishops of the realm. The greatest of all was one which had been sought for in his predecessor's time, and which now was granted through the influence of Thomas of Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester, who, like Earl Robert in past times, appears as a patron of the head church of the city from which he took his title. Walter of Frocester was the first of the abbots of Gloucester to wear the mitre and ring of pontifical rank. We have a glowing description of the ceremonies, spiritual and temporal, which marked the final exaltation of an institution which, in one shape or another, had now lived through seven hundred years. We read of the vast crowd and the stately procession when the Bishop of Worcester sang the mass, while the Abbot stood by in the garb which made him his outward peer, and the lay worshippers were headed by Duke Thomas himself, successor in some sort of Ealdorman Osric in the ancient times. Then followed the banquet, where duke, bishop,

¹ *Ibid.* i. 54. "Nulla vulgaris populi fieret taxatio, nec viri ecclesiastici ullis decimarum pensionibus aliquid opprimerentur, sed tantum mercatores communi assensu pro toto regno, quia pecuniosi erant, guerræ rege opitulam pecuniam ministrarent."

² Stubbs' *Constitutional History* ii., 447.

and abbot feasted together to the sound of music, and the duke again solemnly gave to the abbot the ensigns of his new rank.¹ Without committing oneself to the approval of all the doings of Thomas of Woodstock, when we think of his day at Gloucester and of his end at Calais, one begins to wonder why some share of honours which local reverence paid to his grandfather did not fall to his lot also.

The exact date of the ceremony of which we have just spoken is not given. As Duke Thomas played a part in it and as John Frocester appears as abbot and William Courtenay as archbishop, it must have been between 1381 and 1397. The abbots of Gloucester thus enjoyed their pontifical splendour for about a hundred and fifty years. Then came the great change which in so many places was marked by utter havoc and destruction, but which at Gloucester brought only yet another change of foundation. The abbey of Saint Peter did not share the fate of Winchcombe and vanish from the earth; it did not share the fate of Glastonbury and survive as a shattered ruin; it did not even share the milder fate of Saint Albans, and sink to the level of an ordinary parish church. At Gloucester Henry the Eighth did little more than to undo the work of Wulfstan. The eleventh century had driven out the seculars and brought in the monks; the sixteenth century drove out the monks and brought back the seculars. The church rose in ecclesiastical rank; the mitre and staff of Gloucester were no longer to be symbols of powers which could not be exercised in their fulness. Instead of abbot, prior, and monks, came bishop, dean, and prebendaries. The bishop dwelled in the quarters of the abbot, the dean in the quarters of the prior. The other buildings were parted out among the other members of the new foundation, and that with less of havoc than was generally caused by changes of the kind. A considerable part at least of the revenues of the abbey was restored, to form the separate endowments of the bishop and of his chapter. But it is as well to remember that all this was simply because King Henry chose it

¹ These ceremonies are described at length in the addition to Abbot Frocester's narrative, *Hist. et Cart.* i., 56, 58.

to be so, because his strange wayward will, which seemed to delight equally in pulling down and in setting up, thought good to show mercy at Gloucester, while at Winchcombe he showed no mercy at all, and at Tewkesbury sold an imperfect mercy for money.¹ We should remember that if Henry the Eighth became a new founder of the church of Gloucester, he was able to be so only because church and monastery, lands and tithes, jewels and relics, had passed absolutely into his hands to deal with as he thought good. He had "remorse" at Gloucester; he had none at Coventry, where all the prayers of his faithful servant Bishop Lee could not avail to save the head church of his diocese from destruction. And in parting out the revenues of Saint Peter, one change was not made which a king who came of the stock of the Briton might with special fitness have made. The old wrong-doings of Robert Fitz-hamon and his more famous son-in-law were not undone; they were again confirmed. While Henry was seizing with one hand and granting away with another, it would have been easy for him to restore to the churches of Glamorgan what the conquerors of an earlier day had taken from them. Instead of any such act of justice, among the possessions granted to the newly-founded chapter were the rectories of Llancarfan, Llantwit, Llanblethian, Llantrissant, Pennarth, and Cardiff. Other possessions of the same kind formed part of the endowment of the bishopric.² During the reign of un-law under Edward the Sixth the work of Henry was for a moment undone; Worcester and Gloucester again formed a single bishopric.³ After three years,

¹ See *Monasticon*, ii., 58. It is clear that Tewkesbury was a divided church, of which the western part belonged to the parish, and only the eastern to the abbey. By "the church," in the list of "buildings deemed to be superfluous," is meant only the eastern part or monastic church. This the parishioners bought of the King, and added it to their own parish church in the western limb, which was in no way touched by the dissolution of the monastery. But the eastern Lady chapel perished along with the conventual buildings. At Gloucester, as the whole church belonged to the monastery, the whole church passed into the hands of the King, and he granted it untouched to his new foundation.

² *Ibid.*, i., 557.

³ *Ibid.*, i., 560.

Queen Mary separated them again, and the Gloucester bishopric lived on as a distinct see till its union with Bristol in our own day. For a little more than twelve hundred years the church of Gloucester has lived on under one form or another. One foundation has succeeded another; one material fabric has succeeded another; but the traditions and associations of the place have never been broken. On the old British and Roman site, whose day of desolation could have been of no long endurance, church and city arose again, to live on, changing their form, but never losing their substance. And among all those ages there is one age which stands out conspicuously above all others as the most brilliant time of local history. It was at Gloucester, in the century which beheld the beginnings of the minster that we now see, that Godwine first bearded the stranger in the hall of Eadward, that the first William held the deep speech which led to the making of Domesday, and that the second, in his hour of momentary penitence, thrust the staff of spiritual rule into the unwilling hand of Anselm.
